

26th July 1952]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ We have disposed of so many questions in one hour. At least fifteen minutes may be allowed to discuss the matter.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have received 1,900 questions so far. We cannot be said to have disposed of too many questions in one hour.”

III.—GOVERNMENT MOTION *RE CHANGE* IN THE ORDER OF VOTING ON DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, I beg to move—11.3.

That the order in which the Demands for Grants for the year 1952-53 are to be taken up in accordance with the Motion made and adopted on the 21st July 1952, be modified so that after Demand XIII—Jails, the following Demands may be taken up :—

VII—General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties.

XX—Co-operation.

XVIII—Agriculture.”

This change has been in accordance with the wishes of the Opposition, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That the order in which the Demands for Grants for the year 1952-53 are to be taken up in accordance with the Motion made and adopted on the 21st July 1952, be modified so that after Demand XIII—Jails, the following Demands may be taken up :—

VII—General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties.

XX—Co-operation.

XVIII—Agriculture.”

The motion was carried.

IV.—VOTING ON DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 1952-53—*cont.*

(1) DEMAND XXIV—LABOUR INCLUDING FACTORIES.

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,27,100 under Demand XXIV—Labour including Factories.

“ This Demand relates to the expenditure under the several heads pertaining to the Labour and Factories Department. The Labour Department consists of the following officers, viz., the Commissioner of Labour, two Assistant Commissioners of Labour, fourteen Labour Officers, one Labour Welfare Officer, and four Industrial Tribunals. In addition, the following staff, namely,

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

[26th July 1952]

two Deputy Chief Inspectors of Factories, eight Regional Inspectors and fourteen Inspectors of Factories, one Inspectress of Factories and 199 Assistant Inspectors of Labour are employed in this Department. The Budget provision relates to the expenditure on the above staff and their office establishment.

“ The main function of these departments is to administer the various labour laws and to ensure that the benefits of these laws reach the workers and to promote the industrial peace of the State.

“ Of the important Acts, the most important is the Industrial Disputes Act which was passed in 1947, repealing the Trade Disputes Act, 1927. There was no provision for adjudication in the old Trade Disputes Act.

“ When disputes are brought to the notice of conciliation officers, they try to bring about an amicable settlement of the disputes. If no settlement is possible, they recommend to the Government through the Commissioner of Labour the adjudication of the disputes. After examining the reports submitted by the Conciliation Officers and after satisfying themselves that there is sufficient justification for adjudication, the Government refer the disputes to the Industrial Tribunal for adjudication. The Tribunals after holding enquiries submit their awards to Government and they are published in the *Port St. George Gazette*.

“ Till 1950, there was no provision for appeal against the awards of the Industrial Tribunals. In 1950 the Central Government enacted the Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Act, providing for appeals against the awards of Tribunals. The Act has been in the nature of a silent revolution for adjusting wages to the cost of living and for securing the proper conditions of employment.

“ In 1951, the Government constituted a Tripartite Committee to enquire into the conditions of labour in Textile Industry. The Government have under consideration proposals for the constitution of Tripartite Committees for cement industry, minor engineering industry and hotels.

“ The Factories Act, 1948, provides for the registration and licensing of factories and the safety, health and welfare of workers. This applies to premises where a manufacturing process is carried on with the aid of power and ten or more workers are working and to premises where manufacturing process is carried on without the aid of power if twenty or more workers are working. In this State we have by notification extended the provisions of the Act to non-power factories employing less than twenty but more than nine persons. The Act is a counterpart of the Industrial Disputes Act in so far as it regulates the actual working conditions.

“ *Employees' State Insurance Act*.—The Act is the first of the kind to promote social security of the workers. It provides for

26th July 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

an integrated scheme of social insurance providing for factory workers both medical care and cash benefits in respect of the three contingencies of sickness, employment injury and child birth. Medical benefits will be extended to the workers' families also. It is decided to introduce the scheme in one centre in the State.

Minimum Wages Act, 1948.—This Act provides for fixation of minimum wages in 13 employments specified in the Schedule to the Act. It also regulates the daily hours of work, spread over weekly, days of rest, overtime wages, etc. Government have power to add to the Schedule. Minimum rates of wages have been fixed in 11 of the 12 employments mentioned in Part I of the Schedule to the Minimum Wages Act. No minimum wages have been fixed for employment in lac manufactory mentioned in Part I of the Schedule as the total number of workers is less than 1,000 in the entire State. Minimum wages for employment in agriculture and its ancillary employments like dairy, etc., have to be fixed before 31st December 1953. The Government of India considered that the effect of this legislation will be wholesome if it is applied in low wage areas in this State where wages are abnormally low and call for immediate action. With a view to locate low wage areas, an enquiry has been conducted by the Economic Adviser to Government recently and the analysis of the data collected is in progress. Minimum wages in agriculture will be fixed as early as possible.

Plantations Labour Act, 1951.—This Act provides for the welfare and regulation of the conditions of work of plantation workers. It applies to all tea, coffee, rubber and cinchona plantations of 25 acres or more and where 30 or more persons are employed. The Act has not been brought into force pending framing of rules. In order to secure uniformity in rules, the Government of India have taken up the drafting of model rules under the Act.

The Employees Provident Fund Act.—It was passed by the Parliament recently and is intended to provide provident fund benefits to the industrial employees in factories and establishments engaged in the manufacture or production of cement, cigarettes, electrical, mechanical or general engineering products, iron and steel, paper and textiles. Power is taken to bring other industries within the purview of the Act. Even though some factories and firms have provident fund schemes of their own, most of the factories have no provident fund arrangements. A draft scheme framed under the Act has been published by the Government of India and the question of finalising it is under their consideration. A Regional Provident Fund Commissioner and three Provident Fund Inspectors have been recently appointed for the implementation of the Provident Fund Scheme in this State.

The Madras Shops and Establishments Act, 1947.—This Act provides for the regulation of conditions of work and payment of wages of employees in shops, commercial establishments,

[Mr. U. Krishna Rao]

[26th July 1952]

restaurants, theatres, etc., in this State. The Act has been extended to the City of Madras, all municipalities, and major panchayats. It has been in force for the past four years. The question of amending the Act in the light of the experience gained in its actual working is under consideration.

"The purpose of these legislations, which has been served to some extent, has been to recognize the status of labour in industry and to ensure for it, some share of the profits. Under the awards of Industrial Tribunals, the wages of labour have tended to be related to profits, and to be frequently reinforced by bonus payments absorbing a good part of the profits. This has resulted in giving organized labour a position of leadership in the matter of wages and working conditions. It has also demonstrated the inevitable partnership which exists between employers and employees in the productive process of the country. On the whole, both employers and employees have under these real mutuality of their interests. To this end, the Labour Department is directing its efforts, because in industrial peace is industrial prosperity. Sir, I move the Demand."

MR. SPEAKER :—"Motion moved—

That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,27,100 under Demand XXIV—Labour including Factories.'

I fix three hours for this Demand. The Hon. Minister will reply at 3 o'clock. The hon. Member Mr. K. P. Gopalan will now move his cut motion."

11-40 a.m. * SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

'That the allotment of Rs. 18,27,100 under Demand XXIV—Labour including Factories be reduced by Rs. 100.'

"Sir, I am moving the cut motion for several reasons which I shall state presently. First of all, I am of opinion that of all the departments of the Government, the working of the Labour Department is a miserable failure. Secondly, the attitude of the Congress Government towards labour is very unsympathetic and pro-capitalistic. Thirdly, the Hon. the Labour Minister has stated that the Government have passed so many laws to safeguard the interests of labour, but when we take into consideration the implementation of those laws, it is a failure.

"The Hon. Minister has stated 'In industrial peace is industrial prosperity.' I agree, but industrial peace and industrial prosperity will come only if the workers are conceded their reasonable demands. In this country, so many workers have sacrificed their lives to get freedom of association and organization. So many labour laws have been passed by the Government. But even now have the workers got the right of association in this country? No. I can say that even now the capitalists are suppressing the workers and are not allowing them to form trade unions. Yesterday, I got a report from the Arthala Tea

26th July 1952] [Sri K. P. Gopalan]

Estate in South Malabar that the Manager of that estate was forcing the workers to sign a petition drafted by him. Like this, the workers in many places, are not given the right to form trade unions. In my own place, namely, Palayangadi, the management has forced the workers to affix their signatures to a document which lays down, among other things, that they should resign from the union and that they should receive any wages the Manager fixes.

“Regarding freedom of association, I want to say that if a trade union is formed, the managements will at once dismiss the trade union workers. But I want to submit that according to the spirit and provisions of the Act, if a worker is to be dismissed, he must be given 14 days’ notice. But this provision is not complied with and the workers are dismissed according to the whims and fancies of the employer. Even if the dismissed worker writes about this to the Factory Inspector or the Labour Commissioner, he says he cannot help it. For instance, in Cannanore there are two Factory Inspectors and if the workers approach them, they say that their powers are limited and that they have only to report the matter to the Regional Labour Inspector. Sir, what is the use of spending money in the name of labour and working class if we do not give full powers to the Factory Inspectors in this matter?

“In the Arthala Tea Estate one worker was beaten by the maistry of that estate and another worker was dismissed. This is what is happening in the country now.

“In Madras City, there is a press called the Artisan Press. In this press, there was a dispute between the workers and the management. Efforts towards conciliation failed and after that, the Government never cared to bring up the matter before the Industrial Tribunal. Even subsequently four workers were dismissed. The Labour Officer mediated and said that the dismissal was unjust and that the workers should be taken back. But the press-owner refused to take back the workers. What have the Government done in this matter? Is there any law for compelling the managements to take back the workers? (At this stage, the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“Sir, Article 43 of the Constitution says—

‘The State shall endeavour to secure, by suitable legislation or economic organization or in any other way, to all workers, agricultural, industrial or otherwise, work, a living wage, conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life and full enjoyment of leisure and social and cultural opportunities and, in particular, the State shall endeavour to promote cottage industries on an individual or co-operative basis in rural areas.’

I do not ask the Government to bring about a Communist State, but I want to ask whether they are prepared to implement the provisions contained in the Constitution in so far as they relate to bettering the conditions of the workers.

“Now, I want to deal with the question of industrial disputes and conciliation. We have got the Industrial Disputes Act and

[Sri K. P. Gopalan]

[26th July 1952]

an Amending Act constituting an Appellate Tribunal. These two Acts are Central Acts. I want to know how these Acts are worked in this State. Suppose there is a labour dispute and there is a strike. Will the dispute be taken to the Industrial Tribunal? Suppose a worker has some grievance. He may put forth his grievance before a Court but not before the Industrial Tribunal. His case will never be taken before the Industrial Tribunal. On the other hand, if the interests of the capitalists are endangered, then the dispute will be taken to the Industrial Tribunal or will be considered as a fit case for conciliation. Suppose there is a strike in a factory. The matter will be reported to the Labour Officer who, in turn, will report it to the Labour Commissioner. But it will take months to get a reply. Afterwards, the Labour Commissioner will proceed to the place of dispute and call for the representatives of capital and labour. He will hear their viewpoints and try to conciliate them. Even then, he has got the power to compel the capitalist to accept the just demands of the workers.

11-50
a.m.

"If the conciliation fails, the matter will be referred to an Industrial Tribunal. The Tribunal will take four years to consider the disputes and will give an award in the fifth year or so. When this award is given, the Government cannot enforce it. If a capitalist refuses to abide by the award given by a Tribunal, he will be asked to pay a fine of Rs. 200 or so. In our country the industrialists and capitalists never care for the awards of these Tribunals and if they are fined, they pay the fine and go away. That is the position. The Hon. Labour Minister said that there were Appellate Tribunals. Of course, there is the Appellate Tribunal and its head office is in Bombay. If we take a dispute to that Appellate Tribunal, it will take five years before they come to a decision. In Malabar, the handloom workers of the Chirakkal taluk referred a dispute to the Appellate Tribunal. They wanted to get bonus for 1945, 1946 and 1947. In the years 1945 and 1946, the capitalists got huge profits and so the workers wanted bonus. I wish to bring to the notice of this Honourable House that the Appellate Tribunal has not yet given its verdict in this case, even after five years. Whenever cases are referred to the Tribunal and the Appellate Tribunal, the working class never get any benefit. These serve only as weapons given by the Government to the capitalists for crushing the working class, for smashing the poor toiling workers and for killing the trade union movement. These things only help the capitalists and industrialists to thrive. That is the point that I wish to place before the Hon. Labour Minister. This is the sort of benefit that the poor working class is getting from these Tribunals.

"Now, what are the defects in the working of these Industrial Tribunals and the Appellate Tribunal? The first is that they do not serve as conciliation bodies for the workers, but serve as conciliation bodies for the capitalists and factory-owners. Secondly, no qualified men are appointed to these Tribunals. With due respect to those who are on these Tribunals, I wish to bring

26th July 1952] [Sri K. P. Gopalan]

to the notice of the Hon. Labour Minister that only pensioned officers are appointed to these Tribunals. They will have only a legalistic approach to the problems and will never sympathetically consider the demands of the workers. What is the point in appointing retired Judges and other retired people for such jobs? These people have no experience whatsoever of the labour problems and the difficulties of the working class. Only those people who know something of labour laws, who know the various difficulties and problems of the working class and who have got some sympathy towards the working class must be appointed to these Tribunals. This is what I wish to impress on the Hon. Minister. The third defect is, there is enormous delay. The fourth defect is waste of money. I have got some little experience of these labour unions and how they are working. If a union is asked to conduct a case before a Tribunal, where will the union go for money? I think the workers will be paying a subscription of two annas every month. With this subscription received from the workers, it will not be possible for the union to conduct the cases. Under these circumstances, the working class is not able to conduct the cases before Tribunals in a satisfactory manner. On the other hand, the capitalists and industrialists who have a lot of money with them engage big lawyers to represent their case before Tribunals. They produce many documents and witnesses before the Tribunals. They spend money in so many ways to win their case. But, the poor workers simply stand before the Tribunal being unable to adequately represent their cases as they have no money. In the end, the capitalists succeed in getting a decree in their favour. This is what is happening at the present moment.

“My humble suggestion to the Hon. Labour Minister is that, regarding the settlement of industrial disputes, we must have our own Act. Items 22 to 25 of the Concurrent List in the Constitution refer to this question. The State can make laws. I request the Hon. Minister to bring forward necessary legislation in this regard for settling industrial disputes. We must have our own machinery for settling industrial disputes. There should not be any delay in the settlement of disputes. That is the only point that I wish to stress. Secondly, qualified persons should be appointed to these Tribunals. Thirdly, if the Tribunal gives a certain award, the Government must enforce it by law. There must be permanent industrial courts. The Government may wait for a month and if within that period no settlement is reached, the case must be referred to industrial courts which must be set up in every industrial area.

“About the standing orders, if a worker sees the standing orders, his blood will boil. Because, the Government have framed these orders only to favour and help the capitalists. In framing these orders, the Government must have given due regard to the views of the representatives of labour. I hope the Hon. Minister will look into the matter and see that these orders are changed so as to help the poor labourers and workers.

[Sri K. P. Gopalan]

[26th July 1952]

" The Hon. Labour Minister referred to the Minimum Wages Committee. I have referred to this subject on a former occasion when I was speaking about the beedi factory. The Minimum Wages Committee appointed for the benefit of the municipal workers recommended Rs. 40. What have the Government done? They have fixed only Rs. 25, the basic salary being Rs. 7. For fixing this basic salary of Rs. 7 the Government have spent a huge sum in constituting the Committee and asking them to go into the question. In the beedi factory, the poor workers are getting very low wages. It is high time the Government take up this question in right earnest and see that all workers in factories, industrial establishments and other places get a minimum living wage. The Venkataramayya award also is thrown to the winds now.

" Regarding the standing orders, the Government must appoint a Committee consisting of representatives of labour, factory-owners, and the Government to recommend suitable orders. This is a very modest request and I hope the Government will accede to it. I also request the Government to enforce the recommendations of the Minimum Wages Committee on the factory-owners and other employers.

" At present, the factory-owners are not observing the various provisions of the Shop Assistants Act. In many places, the workers do not know that such an Act exists. This is the case in Cannanore and other places where this Act is supposed to be in force. Workers are asked to work for ten hours and more. They are now undergoing a lot of difficulties and are not at all treated properly. The Shop Assistants Act is not helping them. I appeal to the Hon. Minister for Labour to look into the matter and see that they are relieved of these difficulties. The Government must take some effective steps to help these poor people. The sweet words of the Hon. Chief Minister and the Labour Minister will never help them. They must show their sympathy towards the labourers in action and not in words. The workers will never be benefited by such sweet words. If the Government fail to take effective steps to save these poor people from the exploitations of the capitalists and industrialists and factory-owners then these suffering workers, labourers and others together with all democratic forces in this country will change this Government, and form a National United Democratic Front Government to help themselves out of the difficulties. The Congress Government which talks so much of freedom from slavery and all that, did not care to relieve these workers from slavery under these avaricious capitalists and industrialists. What is the use of the freedom which these Congressmen are supposed to have achieved for the country? These poor toiling workers are continuously being exploited by these heartless capitalists and we don't find any human touch in their approach. I can give facts and figures to prove that the several provisions of the Shop Assistants Act which the Congress Government have passed for the benefit of the workers, are being misused and the workers are not at all benefited

26th July 1952]

[Sri K. P. Gopalan]

by them. These provisions only serve as weapons for the capitalists to crush the workers, workers' organizations and the whole trade union movement. The Government must lose no time in attending to this problem. Otherwise, I warn this Congress Government that the workers will grow impatient out of their untold sufferings and change the Government. Starving men won't wait any longer. This morning it was said that Police officers were stationed in the B. and C. Mills to help the capitalists. If a worker is threatened by the capitalist, or the factory-owner, will the Police be sent immediately there to help the poor worker? No. Therefore, I say that this is a capitalist Government; this is an anti-working class feudal Government. This Government is monopolized by capitalists. This Government will fall if the demands of the working class are not met. Lastly may I humbly request the Government to take immediate and necessary steps to better the conditions of workers in this State? "

12

* SRI R. KUPPUSWAMI :—“கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கனம் தொழில் மந்திரி அவர்கள் கொண்டு வந்த இந்த மானியத்தை நான் ஆதரித்து சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல விரும்புகின்றேன். தொழிலாளர்கள் தங்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைத்தரத்தை உயர்த்திக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று தொழிற்சங்க வாரியாக அவர்களுடைய கிளர்ச்சியை, இன்று மட்டுமல்ல, ஆங்கிலேய சர்க்கார் இருந்த காலத்திலிருந்தே, செய்து கொண்டுவருகிறார்கள். காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்கார் ஏற்பட்டவுடனே, தொழிலாளர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைத்தரத்தை உயர்த்தவேண்டுமென்ற அடிப்படையில், அவர்களுக்குப் போதும் பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கக்கூடிய முறையில் அவர்களுக்கு மத்திய சர்க்காரிலும், மாகாண சர்க்காரிலும், சட்டங்கள் செய்திருக்கின்றார்கள். அந்த சட்டங்களை அவர்கள் தங்களுக்குப் பயன்படக்கூடிய முறையிலே பயன்படுத்திக்கொள்ள அவர்கள் முயற்சி செய்துகொண்டு வருவதிலே பல சிக்கல்கள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. அதற்குத் தகுந்தாற்போல், இன்று தொழிலாளர்கள் தங்களுடைய உரிமைகளைக் காத்துக் கொள்ளக்கூடிய அளவு சட்டங்களை சர்க்கார் செய்திருந்தாலும்கூட, அந்தச் சட்டங்கள் அவர்களுக்குப் பயன்படாதவாறு தடைகளைச் செய்து, அதை அவர்கள் உணர்முடியாத அளவுக்கு அரசியல் கட்சிகளின் பேரால் கம்யூனிஸ்டுகள் போன்ற டலகட்சிகள் தொழிலாளர்களைத் தவறான வழியில் இழுத்துச் சென்று, தொழிற்சாலைப் பிரதேசங்களில் அமைதிபைக் கெடுத்து வருவது எனக்கு நன்கு தெரியும். இன்று சர்க்காருடைய கொள்கை, ‘இந்த தேசத்தில் குறிப்பாக சென்னை மாகாணத்திலுள்ள, தொழிற்சாலைப் பிரதேசங்களில் அமைதியைக் காணவேண்டும், உண்மையாக உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கவேண்டும், தொழிற்சாலைகளைக் காப்பாற்றக்கூடிய அளவுக்கு அதில் வேலை செய்யக்கூடிய தொழிலாளர்கள் தங்களுடைய உரிமைகளை அடையக் கூடிய அளவிற்கு, வாழ்க்கைத்தரம் உயரவேண்டுமென்ற அளவிற்கு,’ இருக்கவேண்டியது அவசியம்.

“ஆனால், தொழிலாளி, முதலாளி இவர்களுக்குள் ஏற்படக்கூடிய சச்சரவுகள், ‘எப்படி ஏற்படுகின்றன? எங்கிருந்து பிறக்கின்றன? எதனால் ஏற்படுகின்றன?’ என்பதைப்பற்றி ஆராய்ந்து பார்த்தால், உண்மையில் சச்சரவுகள் ஏற்படுவதன் காரணம் தெரியும். இந்த சச்சரவுகளை சரியான முறையில் சமாதானம் செய்து, தொழிற்சாலைகளைக் காப்பாற்றக் கூடிய அளவுக்கும், தொழிலாளிகள் அமைதியாக வேலை செய்து, தங்களுடைய ஜீவனோபாயங்களைக் காப்பாற்றிக்கொள்ளும் அளவுக்கும், வழிவகை காணவேண்டியது அவசியம் தான். ஆனால், சர்க்கார் அதற்குத் தகுந்த சட்டங்கள் செய்திருந்தாலும்கூட, அந்தச் சட்டங்களை உடையாக்கக்கூடிய முறையில் சில தவறுகள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. குறிப்பாக எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் தினசரித் தகராறுகள் தொழிற்சாலைகளில் அனேகம் ஏற்படுகின்றன. சிறிய பாக்டரியாக இருந்தாலும் சரி, பெரிய பாக்டரியாக இருந்

[Sri R. Kuppuswami]

[26th July 1952]

தாலும்சரி, தினசரித் தகராறுகள் ஏற்படுகின்றன. இந்தத் தகராறுகளைத் தீர்ப்பதில் லேபர் ஆபீசர் முதற்கொண்டு, லேபர் கமிஷனர் வரைக்கும் தலையிடவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. அப்படித் தலையிட்டு சமாதானம் செய்யும் போது சில சந்தர்ப்பங்களில் சமாதானம் தவறிவிடுகிறது. சமாதானம் தவறிவிட்டால் வேலை நிறுத்தம் போன்ற நிகழ்ச்சிகள் ஏற்பட்டு உற்பத்திக்குப் பங்கம் ஏற்படுகிறது. உற்பத்திக்குப் பங்கம் ஏற்பட்டால் தேசத் துற நஷ்டம்.

“இம்மாதிரி தொழிலாளர்கள் சமாதானத்தைக் காணும்போதும், முதலாளிகள் சமாதானத்தைக் காணும்போதும், இருசாரரும் சமாதானம் அவசியமென்று உணருகின்ற அளவுக்கு இன்னும் போதிய பயிற்சியை முடலாளிகளும் அடையவில்லை, தொழிலாளிகளும் அடையவில்லை யென்று நான் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ள ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். அதற்கு சர்க்கார் அவசியம் ஒரு ஏற்பாடு செய்யவேண்டும்.

“இன்றைய தினம் தொழிலாளர்கள் முதலாளிகளைக் கண்டு ஆத்திரப்படுவதும், முதலாளிகள் ஏராளமான லாபத்தை சம்பாதித்துக் கொண்டார்கள், அந்த லாபத்தில் பங்குவேண்டும், தாங்கள் பெறுகின்ற ஊதியம் மிகக் குறைவு’ என்று மனக்குறையின் காரணமாகக் கிளர்ச்சி செய்வதும் வழக்கம். சம்பள உயர்வுக்கு கிளர்ச்சி செய்யும்போது எந்த அடிப்படையில் அமைதிக்கு பங்கமின்றி கிளர்ச்சி இருக்கவேண்டுமென்பதில் சர்க்கார் போதிய கவனத்தை செலுத்தி, சமாதானம் ஏற்படக்கூடிய அளவுக்கு ஒரு வகை செய்யவேண்டும்.

“சாதாரணமாக ஒரு பாக்கியை ஆரம்பிக்க ‘ஒரு முதலாளி எவ்வளவு முதல் போடுகிறான். அந்த முதலை வைத்து எவ்வளவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கி, வியாபாரம் செய்து, லாபத்தை அடைகிறான்’ என்பதான கணக்கு தொழிலாளிகளுக்குத் தெரியாது. ஆனால், வருஷ முடிவில் பாலன்ஸ் ஷீட் தயார் செய்கின்றார்கள். பாலன்ஸ் ஷீட் தயார் செய்து, தங்களுடைய ஆடிட்டரை வைத்துக்கொண்டு, கணக்கைச் சரிபார்த்து, ஸேல்ஸ் டாக்ஸ், இன்கம் டாக்ஸ் ஆபீசர்களுக்குக் கணக்கை அனுப்பிவிடுகிறார்கள். குறிப்பிட்ட பாக்கியில் முதலாளிகளின்கீழ் வேலைசெய்கின்ற தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு, ‘வரவுசெலவுத் திட்டங்கள் என்ன? எப்படி பாலன்ஸ் ஷீட் தயார் செய்கின்றார்கள்? அந்தக் கணக்கு சரியாகத் தயார் செய்யப்பட்டதா?’ என்றெல்லாம் தொழிலாளர்களுக்குத் தெரியாத காரணத்தினால், தொழிற்சாலைகளில் லாபம் இருந்தாலும் சரி, இல்லாவிட்டாலும் சரி, முதலாளிக்கு லாபம் இருப்பதாகத்தான் தொழிலாளி நினைத்துக்கொள்ளுகிறான். உண்மையில் தொழிற்சாலையில் லாபம் இல்லாவிட்டால், லாபம் இருக்கிறதென்று சொல்வதில் தவறு இருக்கிறது. உண்மையில் லாபம் இருந்து, எனக்கு லாபமே இல்லையென்று முதலாளிகள் சொல்வதிலும் எந்த விதமான அரித்தரமும் இல்லை. இம்மாதிரி அடிப்படையான ஒரு விஷயத்தில் தான் அனேகமாக தொழிற்சாலைகளில் தகராறு சம்பள விஷயத்தில் ஏற்படும். சர்க்கார் தலையிட்டு அதற்குத் தகுந்த சட்டங்களைச் செய்து, ‘வருஷ ஆரம்பத்தில் முதலாளி போட்ட முதல் என்ன? வருஷ முடிவில் லாபம் என்ன? வரவு செலவுகள் என்ன? என்று தொழிலாளிகளுடைய’ பிரதிநிதிகளையும், முதலாளிகளையும் வைத்துக்கொண்டு கிரங்க்யாக இருவரும் ஒத்துக்கொள்ளக்கூடிய அளவுக்கு, கணக்கைப் பரிசீலனை செய்ய, கூடுமானவரையில் சர்க்காரும் கூட இதில் தலையிடாமல், தொழிலாளிகளும் முதலாளிகளும் சேர்ந்து அந்தக் கணக்குகளை பரிசீலனை செய்து ஒத்துக்கொள்ளக்கூடிய அளவுக்கு ஒரு சூழ்நிலையை உண்டாக்கினால் கண்டிப்பாக கூடியவரைக்கும் தொழிற்சாலைப் பிரதேசங்களில் அமைதி ஏற்படுமென்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம்.

“ஆனால், இன்று நமது தேசத்தில் அம்மாதிரி இல்லை. முதலாளிகள் சொல்லக்கூடிய கணக்கை தொழிலாளி ஒப்புக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். தொழிலாளிகள் அதை ஒப்புக் கொள்ள மறுத்தால் சர்க்கார் மத்தியஸ்தம் (அட்ஜூடிகேஷன்) வைத்திருக்கிறது. அட்ஜூடிகேஷன் தீர்ப்பு எப்படி வேண்டுமானாலும் இருக்கலாம். தொழிலாளிகளுக்குச் சாதகமாக இருக்க

26th July 1952]

[Sri R. Kuppaswami]

லாம் அல்லது முதலாளிகளுக்குச் சாதகமாக இருக்கலாம். தொழிலாளிகளுக்குப் பாதகமாக இருக்கலாம் அல்லது முதலாளிகளுக்குப் பாதகமாக இருக்கலாம். இம்மாதிரி சர்க்கார் சட்டபூர்வமாகத் தலையிட்டு எந்த சமாதானம் செய்தாலும் அது இருசாராருக்கும் திருப்தியாக இருக்காது. இரு சாராருக்கும் திருப்தியில்லையென்று சொன்னால் உற்பத்தி குறையும். தொழிலாளிகளுக்கு வேலையில் உற்சாகம் இருக்காது. முதலாளிகளுக்கும் தங்களுடைய முதலைப் போட்டு, தொழிற்சாலைയിல் வேலை செய்து அதிகப் படியான உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கி தொழிற்சாலையை நல்ல முறையில் நடத்தி வருவேண்டுமென்ற உற்சாகம் ஏற்படாது.

“அதனால், சர்க்கார் தொழிற்சாலைகளில் அமைதியைக் காணவேண்டுமென்றால், முதலாளிகளுக்கும் தொழிலாளிகளுக்கும் சரியான ஒரு சமாதானத்தை உண்டாக்கவேண்டுமென்றால், முதலில் அந்தந்த பாக்டரியில், சின்ன பாக்டரி, பெரிய பாக்டரி, எந்த தொழிற்சாலையாக இருந்தாலும் சரி, வரவு செலவுக் கணக்கில் இரு சாராருக்கும், சர்க்கார் தலையிடாமலேயே சமாதான உடன்படிக்கை ஏற்படக்கூடிய அளவுக்கு ஒரு கொள்கையை வகுக்கவேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக இன்னும் முக்கியமாக கோயமுத்தூர், மதுரை, சென்னை போன்ற பிரதேசங்களில் ஏராளமான தொழிற்சாலைகள் இருக்கின்றன. இப்பொழுது ‘தொழில் தகராறுகள் ஏற்பட்டு, அதனால் வேலை நிறுத்தம் ஏற்பட்டு விடுமோ’ என்ற பயம் ஏற்படுகிற காலத்தில்தான் சர்க்கார் தலையிட்டு, அட்ஜாடிகேஷன் கொடுக்கின்றார்கள். இப்பொழுது, தொழில் தகராறுகள் ஏராளமாக இருக்கிற காலத்தில் கோயமுத்தூர், மதுரை, சென்னை நகரம் போன்ற சென்னை மாகாணத்திலிருக்கின்ற தொழில் பிரதேசங்களை, 4, 5 பிரதேசங்களாக ஒன்றுசேர்த்து தொழிற்சாலைப் பிரதேசமாக மாற்றி, நிரந்தரமான இன்டஸ்ட்ரீஸ் கோர்ட்டுகளை அங்கங்கே ஏற்படுத்தவேண்டும். இதுமாதிரி நிரந்தரமான இன்டஸ்ட்ரீஸ் கோர்ட்டுகள் இப்பொழுது கிடையாது. அதற்காக சர்க்கார் உடனடியாக ஒரு திட்டம் வகுக்க வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு, இந்த மான்யத்தை ஆதரித்து, என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI:—“Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Cut Motion. In doing so, I wish to bring to the notice of the Government the irregularities and the unfair practices resorted to and the mal-administration of what is euphemistically called the Labour Department, whereas it should be correctly characterized as the Employers' Department. It is true that my criticisms will be levelled against the previous Ministry with regard to certain incidents and episodes. But it is necessary to narrate them, and to refer to them, because unless the present Ministry is apprised of these irregularities, it will not be possible for them, if they are so minded, to take effective action to remedy matters. I have known the present Minister for Labour as my colleague in the City Corporation Council as a man of integrity, and I have the greatest regard for him for his sincerity of purpose. But, at the same time, as he is a man new to the field of industrial relations I must warn him that unless he is ready to take effective and affirmative steps to cleanse the Augean's stables of the Labour Department, if I may mix my metaphors, it may turn out to be the graveyard of his reputation, that of the Congress and of the present Ministry of which he is a Member.

12-10
p.m.

“Since the beginning of the last war and more particularly since the end of the last war, various efforts have been made by the Government of India to place on the Statute Book some

[Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai] [26th July 1952]

labour laws with a view to further the establishment of what the Congress calls a Welfare State. A new Factories Act has been brought into force. The Industrial Disputes Act has come into force. The Minimum Wages Act has come into force. The Industrial Disputes Appellate Tribunal Act and several other Acts referred to by the Hon. the Minister for Labour have been brought into force. I must say, Sir, that through these Acts and laws the Government have now created a new occupation or profession. A profession of blackmail is being practised under the guise of enforcement of labour legislation. A host of factory inspectors have been appointed whose main function is to blackmail petty traders, small industrialists and others into giving them hush money on their promising that they will not be prosecuted. If only the Hon. the Minister for Industries would care to examine the number of prosecutions that have been sanctioned and launched against traders and industrialists for alleged violation of labour laws, he will know that the people who have been so charged were only petty traders and small industrialists and the big sharks, the big shop-keepers and big employers who are violating the laws have escaped with immunity and impunity. It is true that my criticism is only general. But I can also illustrate it with one or two instances to show how the Labour Department has refused to investigate any allegation of violation of labour legislation, if that allegation referred to big employers who could wield great influence with the Ministers. In November 1950, I brought to the notice of the Commissioner of Labour that Mr. Goenka, an important employer in the newspaper industry, was systematically violating the Factories Act and that the overtime rates of wages prescribed under the Factories Act were not being paid to any worker whatsoever. The Commissioner of Labour refused to investigate the case unless I got him specific instances. I told him that on no occasion was the Act obeyed. Nevertheless, I gave him, later, one or two instances. Let me tell hon. Members why he put me this question of furnishing specific instances. That question was put to me on the assumption that workers would normally be afraid to give their names and furnish details as to the days on which they worked overtime, the days for which they were not paid overtime wages, etc., for the reason that their employer would discover who gave this information to the labour leaders and victimize them. Despite this fear of victimization, I gave specific instances to him—names of persons who worked, the days on which they worked and the days for which they were not paid wages. One and a half years have elapsed since then and no efforts have been made by the Labour Department in this matter to set things right even though they know that Mr. Goenka was violating the provisions of the Factories Act. This is the manner in which the officials of the Labour Department administer the Factories Act. That is why I say that the present labour laws administered by the present personnel of the Labour Department have created a class of professional blackmailers.

26th July 1952] [Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai]

“ Let me now come to another aspect of labour administration. With regard to enforcement of awards given by Industrial Tribunals, if we go into the records we will find that there is enormous delay in the implementation of these awards by the employers. But little or no action is taken by the Government. If we read the recent Administration Report of the State, we will find that, only in six cases, prosecutions have been launched against the employers for non-enforcement of awards. Here again, let me illustrate my case with an instance or two, with which I am thoroughly acquainted. In 1947, as President of the Chrome Leather Workers' Union, I was in touch with the authorities on a dispute that arose as a result of low wages being paid to the workers. They were paid at the rate of eight or nine annas per day. In spite of my writing to the officials concerned, the Government refused to refer that dispute to a tribunal for adjudication. In sheer desperation, the workers went on strike in order to arrive at some settlement with the employer. The matter was referred to the Industrial Tribunal nearly eight months later. The management of that company, however, went up to the High Court and got an order to the effect that the Tribunal had no jurisdiction to arbitrate on the dispute. Finally, the matter was taken to the Supreme Court which held that the Government had the right to refer disputes to the Industrial Tribunals for adjudication. The award was given two years later, that is, in 1949. That award has not been implemented yet. What is the action the Government have taken to bring the management to book for non-enforcement of the award? When was action taken? In 1952, the Government prosecuted the management of the Chrome Leather Co., Ltd., for the non-enforcement of the award given in 1949 and the management has been fined Rs. 25! The workers are supposed to be satisfied with this meagre fine of Rs. 25 imposed on the management. The Industrial Disputes Act gives enormous powers to the Government of Madras and other authorities to deal with the management more severely. The Industrial Disputes Act gives power to the Government to collect arrears of wages due to the workers under awards of Tribunals as though they were arrears of land tax. Whilst workers have been deprived of their legitimate wages for three years, no action has been taken by Government under these powers. Let me now take the other side of the picture. When, for instance, some labour leader violates technically one of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, there is no hesitation, no reluctance, and no delay, in prosecuting him and other officials of the union. I have myself been a victim of this policy along with various other members of the Executive Committee of the Madras Labour Union—Mr. Pakkiriswami Pillai and M. V. Elumalai and others for not complying with the provision of giving fourteen days' notice for a strike in the B. & C. Mills. On the other hand, at about the same time in October 1950, the management of the B. & C. Mills refused to implement the award which was given by the Madras Industrial Tribunal in spite of the fact that the Appellate Tribunal refused to give a stay of the award. What was the action taken by the Labour Department of the

[Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai] [26th July 1952]

Government for this violation? No action whatever has yet been taken. I submit, Sir, there is one law for the rich and another for the poor. It is in this manner that the Labour Department is administering labour legislation. A lot of bitterness exists with regard to the manner in which industrial disputes are referred to Industrial Tribunals.

“Again the Labour officials who are supposed to supervise the implementation of the provisions of the legislation are themselves open to temptation. Action or inaction on the part of the Labour official in connexion with the reference of industrial disputes to a Tribunal may mean to a particular employer lakhs and lakhs of rupees. If he pays starvation wages, he knows a reference to the Tribunal would mean increase in the amount he has to pay by way of wages. Therefore, that employer would be ready to persuade in various dubious ways the concerned Labour official in order to see that the matter is not referred for adjudication.

“Let me cite specific instances in support of what I have said. Yesterday, my hon. Friend, Mr. Pakkiriswami Pillai referred during question-time to the non-reference of the dispute in the Ambi Ayyar's Hotel case. An award has been given by the Madras Industrial Tribunal in the catering trade. That award has raised the wages of workers and the dearness allowance and holidays for workers. I know for certain that Government have called upon Labour officers in the City of Madras to persuade other managements to implement these wage scales and rates of dearness allowance. Despite the fact that Mr. Ambi Ayyar is not paying these wages, the Commissioner recommends that the dispute should not be referred to the Tribunal. When the matter is taken to the concerned Secretary to the Government in the Development Department, he writes saying that for some reasons it cannot be referred to the Tribunal. When I protest and write to him saying that it is utterly discriminatory, I don't get a reply for two months. After two months when I saw him, he told me that he had instructed the Labour Commissioner to settle the particular matter by advising the management of Ambi's Cafe to implement the award in respect of scale of wages. After a delay of another two months, when my hon. Friend Mr. Pakkirisawmi Pillai, puts a question now in this House, the same reply is given. Are the workers to wait for months together simply to see whether the dispute will be referred to the Tribunal or not? This particular delay cannot be, I say is not, a haphazard delay. It is purposive delay, it is delay for the purpose of benefiting a particular employer, in whom the Labour Commissioner is interested.

“Let us take certain other disputes. The Hotel Industry award, which I have already referred to, has raised the rates of wages to Rs. 26 per mensem and the dearness allowance to Re. 0-2-6 for every point rise in the index. The total emoluments that a worker in the industry now gets, work out to Rs. 56 to Rs. 60. A very big company, the Spencer & Company, is also

26th July 1952] [Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai]

in the catering trade. The wage it pays to the servers and waiters is only Rs. 9 to Rs. 10 per mensem. The dearness allowance is about Rs. 25 to Rs. 30. Despite the fact that it is very big employer, it pays lower rates than the petty hotel proprietors employing two or three workmen. Efforts were made by the employees to persuade the Government to refer the dispute regarding wages to the Tribunal. The concerned Labour officer recommended that the basic wage should be raised to Rs. 26 per mensem but the Commissioner of Labour immediately took up the file and saw to it that the Government did not refer the dispute to the Tribunal. After nine months of fruitless persuasion, the workers went on strike. After that, the case was taken to the High Court. After the issue of a *writ of mandamus*, the Government appealed against it. Finally the result was, they referred the question of the dismissals consequent on the strike, to the Industrial Tribunal. That is the manner in which the important officials of the Labour Department deal with genuine industrial disputes. The same applies *mutatis mutandis* to the question of reference to the Tribunal of the disputes in the Express Group of papers and *Swadaesamitran*. I say this was done in conspiracy with the concerned employers because they happened to have influence with the Government to see that these disputes were not referred to the Tribunal. In the *Swadesamitran* Printers Company, every worker who was a committee member was singled out and under the guise of retrenchment was dismissed. After the dismissal, we were told that the employers were being given two months' time to consider the recommendations of the Commissioner of Labour. The Commissioner very cleverly assumed that, during the two months the union would collapse because the committee members had been dismissed and in the end he could say the Union had ceased to exist and, therefore, no reference need be made. That is how the Commissioner of Labour has been administering the Act in the interests of the employers.

12-30
p.m.

"Take again the case of the textile workers. In the B. & C. Mills dispute, the Appellate Tribunal gave an award to the effect that the subsistence basic wage for a worker in Madras City should be Rs. 28 per mensem and that once the question of the region to which a uniform wage was applicable was settled, the fair wage should be fixed at something higher than Rs. 28. But with a view to postponing the matter, the Government appointed a tripartite committee to go into the question of wages for textile workers. Investigations have been going on for more than a year and a free licence has been granted to the employers in this industry to deal with the workers as they please.

"Sir, the Hon. Minister referred to the manner in which minimum wages have been fixed in the State. It is a farce. It is a cruel joke that is being played against the workers. The minimum wages have been fixed at Rs. 26 per mensem inclusive of all allowances, by a high-power committee after investigations lasting over one year. This wage is not even sufficient to enable the worker to purchase his family rations like rice, wheat or milo. Is this kind of fixation of sub-human minimum wages

[Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai] [26th July 1952]

intended for the purpose of informing the U.N.O. that the Government of Madras or the Government of India have passed minimum wage legislation and are protecting the interests of the workers in this State? I ask, is it merely window dressing for international purposes or for genuinely meeting the needs of the workers and raising their standard of living? It is better that the Government repeal this legislation and say they have no legislation than to make a pretence that they have provided relief for workers in sweated industries.

Lastly, let me come to concrete suggestions. With regard to implementation and enforcement of the Factories Act, the Factory Inspectors should be required to consult trade unions and if they should require a particular Inspector to carry out a surprise raid on a particular factory, he should comply with the request. With regard to the reference of disputes for adjudication, let me remind the House that the Chief Minister advised the then Ministry not to refer the dispute in the B. & C. Mills in 1947, to an Industrial Tribunal and stated that the Government themselves should go into the dispute and effect a settlement. I see no reason why the same procedure should not be adopted by the present Government in certain major disputes, instead of depending on inefficient, biased and corrupt officials to settle disputes."

* SRI K. T. SRIDHARAN :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Cut Motion. I am sorry to say that the Madras Government have no definite labour policy and consequently labour is being exploited by the capitalists and other selfish managements. This is the main cause for the labour unrest in our country. You know, Sir, labour is always trying to better its working and wage conditions. I urge upon the Government to pursue more a preventive policy than a curative policy. The Government should see that labour is given proper wages. The Government should appoint a committee to go into the question of working conditions of all the workers in the different industries of this State and also see that its recommendations are implemented by all the parties. Labour unrest can be got over if this is done. At present, if labour puts forward certain demands, the Labour officers refer them to the managements and if there is any difficulty, the whole matter will be referred to the Government. The Government will in turn refer the matter to an adjudicator. Awards of adjudicators are not generally implemented by the managements and this is how labour unrest is growing. I fully agree with the hon. Member, Mr. Kuppaswami, that the workers must be given a chance to study the profit and loss accounts of the factories, as this would help labour to know the real position of the industries. I wish to go a step further and say that the Government should bring forward a legislation that the labour representatives should be allowed by the management to study the profit and loss accounts of the industries so that there may not be any misunderstanding about the profit or loss accounts. I request the Government to consider this question in detail.

26th July 1952] [Sri K. T. Sridharan]

“ There are Works Committees in all the factories. As far as I could understand, the Committees are doing practically nothing. The labour representatives cannot give any suggestions and ask them to be carried out. The Works Committees are only helping to sabotage the working of labour unions. I, therefore, request the Government to abolish this system of Works Committees.

“ Regarding the implementation of awards, I wish to bring one important case to the notice of the Hon. the Minister for Labour. There was a labour disputes in Chirakkal taluk in the handloom factories and an award was given by the adjudicator. Over that, the managements preferred an appeal to the Appellate Court and the workers are still awaiting the decision. Sir, this is a matter respecting bonus and increment in wages in 1945, 1946 and 1947. It is really painful that the Government, whose duty is to safeguard the interests of the workers, have not taken a decision till now. For the last six months every handloom worker is really starving and the Government have not done anything to relieve their distress. When thousands of workers and their dependents are suffering, the Government, if it is worth the name, should rush to the help of the labourers and show that they have a soft corner for labour. If the Government are not inclined to help labour, I am sure they will certainly lose the backing of the working class of this State. I, therefore, request the Hon. the Minister for Labour to give them some financial help in lieu of, say, subsistence loans. Whenever a question is put to the Hon. Minister, he simply says that there is agreement between the management and the workers. There is in fact no agreement. All the political parties, Congress, Socialist, Communist and Praja, have issued an appeal to the managements as well as to the workers that the workers should work on decreased wages and that the managements should give work on that basis. Even so, not even a single factory has been opened in Malabar. I, therefore, request the Hon. Minister to help the handloom workers of this State.”

• SRI K. RANGA RAO :—“ ఈ దినము సభ్యుల ముందుత్వము లేబరు డిమాండ్ 12-40
 దును వ్యతిరేకించుచూ కట్టావనను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వము గత అయిదు p.m.
 సంవత్సరాలనుండి కార్మికులయొడల అనుసరించుచున్న విధానము కార్మికులయొక్క
 యూనియన్లను నిరేకించుచూ జరిపినటువంటి ఆత్మాచారాలకు విరక్తముగానూ
 సంజాయిషీ యివ్వకుండా యున్నది. కార్మికమీద ఆత్మాచారాలు, అక్రమదర్శనలు
 అన్నింటికీ యజమానుల సలహాలను యీ ప్రభుత్వము తీసుకొని అనేకమైన అన్యాయాలచేసింది. కార్మికనాయకులను రిటైను చేయటే కాక అనేకమందిని కాల్చివేసింది.
 కార్మికులు యీ ప్రభుత్వానికి పూర్తిగా వ్యతిరేకంగా మారటానికి యీ ప్రభుత్వ విధానమే కారణము. అంతేకాక గతంలో కార్మికులయొక్క కష్టాలను యీ ప్రభుత్వము
 యొక్క వైఖరిమే కాదు. అందువల్ల యూరోజు ఈ కాలెగ్రేసు ప్రభుత్వము గత
 అయిదు సంవత్సరాలనుండి అనుసరించిన ఆత్మాచారాలకుకూడా, సంజాయిషీ చెప్ప
 కుండా, కార్మికులను సహాయము చెయ్యమంటుంది. ఇప్పుడు చక్రవర్తి రాజగోపాలా
 చారిగారి మృతివర్తమకూడా గత అయిదు సంవత్సరములనుండియున్న కాలెగ్రేసు

[Sri K. Ranga Rao]

[26th July 1952]

ప్రభుత్వ విధానమే అనుసరిస్తున్నట్లు కన్పించుచున్నది. ఇంత వరకుకూడా కార్మికులు కోరికలుపంపి వక్కులనుగాని సహాయముగాని గుర్తించకుండా శ్రుతివిధానమునబట్టి వీరి పాలసీ విశదమగుచున్నది. యజమానులు, కార్మికులయడల యే విధమైన విధానము అనుసరిస్తున్నారో ప్రభుత్వంవారిని గమనించమని కోరుతాను. ఈ కార్మికులలో నూటికి యాభదిమంది పల్లెలనుంచి పొట్టకూటికోసంవచ్చి పనిచేయుచున్నారు. ఈ కార్మికులలో ఎంతమంది పనిలేకవుంటున్నారో, వీరి కుటుంబపోషణకు ఏ విధమైన వక్కులు కోరుతున్నారో, యివి ఏ విధంగా పరిష్కారము ఆశ్రయిస్తాయో, వీరికి యేమైనా relief ప్రస్తుతము లేదా అనేటటువంటి ఆలోచన యీ ప్రభుత్వానికి లేకుండా యున్నది. ప్రభుత్వం యజమానులకే సహాయము చేయవిధానమును అవలంబిస్తూంటే కార్మికులకు కుటుంబపోషణ జరుగుచున్నదా అనేసంగతి ఎందుకులేసుకొని ఆలోచించును? శ్రమశక్తిని అమ్మకొను వృత్తిని, జీవించే లక్షలాది కార్మికులు కోరికలు పంపి కనీసపు వక్కులు అములుజరుపమని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని వదిలివేయుగా పోలీసునుపెట్టి అణగారినట్లు సహజ ఆలవాటుయింది. ఈ ప్రభుత్వం యజమానుల లోపాలు, వారు అనుసరించే వర్గము ఏ విధముగా ఉన్నవో గుర్తించుతూ, వారికి సహాయపడుచున్నది. ఇంచే కాకుండా యజమానుల రక్షణకొరకు ప్రభుత్వము పోలీసు సహాయముగూడా యిచ్చి వారిని బలపరుచుచున్నది. అంచేకాని యే న్యాయ విధానమును అవలంబించి పట్లయితే కార్మికులకు కుటుంబపోషణ జరుగవో అట్టిది చేయుకుండా, యజమానుల ఆక్రమణ ఆత్మచారాలు, లోపాలు కాపాడు విధానమును యీ ప్రభుత్వము అవలంబించుచున్నదని పూర్తిగా కనబడుచున్నది. యిప్పటికైనా యీ ప్రభుత్వము కార్మికుల వక్కులను, కార్మిక యజమానుల లోపాలను గుర్తించవలెననికోరుతున్నాను. బెజవాడలో సుమారు ఒక వెయ్యిమందికిపైగా పౌండ్రీలలో (foundries) పనిచేస్తూ యంద్రాకూలలో శ్రుతివారు ఆక్రమణ ఒక నూరుమందివారేమే సేసు పనిచేస్తున్నారు. అంచేకాకుండా యేబారు జూబ్ మిల్లులో సుమారు 14 వందలమంది కార్మికులు పనిచేస్తూ యున్నారు. ఇసుము తెప్పించుటకు కావలసిన వ్యాగములు ప్రభుత్వం సప్లయిచేయని కారణంవల్ల, యజమానులు ప్యాక్టరీలు మూయబోతున్నామని కార్మికులకు వోటిసులిచ్చారు. తరతరాలుగా పనిచేస్తున్నటువంటి కార్మికుల జీవన దృఢి

“వెరగడము లేకపోగా నిరుద్యోగం ఎదుర్కొంది. ఇదవల్ల యీ రోజులలో అనేక మంది కార్మికులు పనిలేకుండా నిరుద్యోగులవుచున్నారు. ఇదేరకంగా సర్కారు జిల్లాలో I.L.T.D. పొగాకు కంపెనీయన్నది. ఈ కంపెనీకి గుంటూరు, కృష్ణా, తూర్పుగోదావరి, పశ్చిమ గోదావరి జిల్లాలలో అనేక బ్రాంచిలుఉన్నవి. యీ కంపెనీకింద కార్మికుల సంఖ్య యంతవుంటుందో ప్రభుత్వంవారిని గమనించగోరుతాను. ఇక్కడకూడా కార్మికులకు సరియైన వేతనములు యివ్వడమేలేదు. ఎక్కువ వేతనములకు డిమాండుచేస్తే పోలీసులనుతెచ్చి కార్మికులమీద కాల్పులు కాల్చుచున్నారు. వీరే డిమాండుచేస్తే యీ రాష్ట్రములో యీ పొగాకు వ్యాపారమువల్ల కోట్లాది డబ్బు గణించి ఎక్కువపోతున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వమువారు వారికి సహాయము చేస్తే, కార్మికుల జీవనధాని ఏవిధంగా వాగుడుమో ఆలోచించగోరుతాను. చిన్న చిన్న కంపెనీలు యీ పెద్ద పెట్టుబడిదారులతో పోటి చేయలేక మానుకోవడంవల్ల, వేలాది కార్మికులకు పని లేకుండా యుంటూయన్నది.

“ఇక వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు, భూస్వాములకు సంబంధంగా అదేవిధముగా వుంటున్నది. వ్యవసాయంవల్లనైనా పొట్టుపోసుకుందామనే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో చాలామంది కార్మికులు అనేక ప్రాంతాలకు వెళ్ళవలసిన పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడుచున్నవి. యీ కార్మికులకు ఎక్కడచూచినా, ఏ విధమైనటువంటి సహాయము జరుగుటలేదు. ప్రస్తుతము

26th July 1952]

[Sri K. Ranga Rao]

అమలులోనన్న లేబరు చట్టాన్ని అమలు పెడుతున్నప్పుడు వీరి జీవనభృతికి సరిపోవు కనీస కూలి ఇచ్చేటట్టు ఒక స్పష్టమైన పాలీసీని నిర్ణయించాలని కోరుతున్నాను. యిప్పుడున్న టువంటి చట్టానికి సరియైన సవరణ చేయించవలెను యీ డిమాండును ప్రవేశపెట్టిన లేబరు మంత్రిగారి ఉపన్యాసంలో రాశికులు, కోరే చాక్కులు, వేతనాలనుగురించిన సూచనలు లేనందున కార్మికులు చాలా నిరుత్సాహపడుతున్నారు. వ్యవసాయ కార్మికులవిషయంలోను పాలేర్నకోసమున్నా ప్రభుత్వంవారు శ్రద్ధలీనుకోవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను.

‘శరణాగత Tribunals విషయంలో ఒక విషయం చెప్పదలచాను. Tribunals కార్మికులకు యజమానులకు మధ్య తగాదాలు వచ్చినప్పుడు, వాటిని Tribunals కు వప్పించుచున్నారు. యీ తగాదాలు settle అయ్యేటప్పటికి చాలాకాలము పడుతున్నది. ఇన్నాళ్లు పట్టినను, చివరికి కార్మికులకే అన్యాయం జరుగుచున్నది యీ Tribunals యీ పెట్టుబడిదారులకే సహాయము చేస్తున్నదికాని కార్మికులకు విమోచనమైన relief చేయలేకుండావున్నది. ఈ Industrial Tribunalస్ ఆనుసరిము ఉన్న విధానముచూస్తే యీ Tribunals యిచ్చేటటువంటి తీర్పులు అన్నీ చాలా ఆ కరుణగా ఉన్నవి. పనితత్వలేబరు కమిషనరు యీ disputes విషయంలో తన discrimination ఉపయోగించు హక్కు కలిగియున్నాడు. దీనివల్ల తనయిష్టం వచ్చిన తగాదాలనే ఇంజనీరియర్ టిబ్యునల్ కు చేయించున్నాడు. ప్రతి కార్మిక సమస్యను నూతన యీ Industrial Tribunals కు పంపవలయుననియు లేబరు కమిషనర్ల discrimination powers (వివక్షతావికారం) రద్దచేసి, ప్రతితగాదాను Tribunal కు పంపివేయడం చాలావరకు కార్మికులకు న్యాయంజరుగుతుంది అనుకుంటాను. యిప్పుడు యీ లేబరు ఆఫీసర్లు యజమానులకు, పెట్టుబడిదారులకు లొంగిపోయి అన్యాయాలు నూతన చేస్తున్నారు. ఈ Industrial Tribunals యిచ్చినటువంటి తీర్పులు Appellate Tribunal బొంబాయికి ఆపీలు చేసుకోవలసియున్నది. యిది కార్మికులు భగించునది కాదు. అది వీరికి అందువారుకాదు. ఈ Appellate Tribunals చేస్తూఉన్న పని ముదిటంటే, Industrial Tribunals యిచ్చినటువంటి తీర్పులలో కార్మికులకు అనుకూలంగావున్న తీర్పులను రద్దచేసి యజమానులకు సహాయంచేయటే, కార్మికులకు ఎవ్వరైనా రివిఫ్ కాదు. ఈ Appellate Tribunals యజమానులకు సహాయ పడుటకు ఏర్పడినవియేకాని, న్యాయమైన తీర్పులు యిచ్చేటందుకు ఏర్పడలేదని స్పష్టమగుచున్నది. ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగులు చూద్దామా, యజమానులకు లొంగిపోయి వారియొక్క ఆక్రమాల రద్దచేయడానికే చేస్తున్నారు. యజమానులు యీ లేబరు డిపార్టుమెంటువారిని కార్మికుల చేయి సమ్మెలను భగ్నముచేయుటకు ఉపయోగించుకుంటున్నారు. Appellate Tribunals చేసేది, కాలయాపన, అన్యాయం తప్పు మరేమీలేదు గనుక, ఇండియా గవర్నమెంటు వారిని యీ Appellate Tribunals రద్దచేయాలని యీ రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వం కోరాలనినా డిమాండు. యింత ఆలస్యము, ఆక్రమ తీర్పులకు బదులు, ప్రభుత్వంవారు అన్ని వివాద విషయాలను ఒకే Tribunal కు పంపించి, వారిరువురైనా ఆపీలుచేయగోట్లకు యిస్తేనే న్యాయం జరుగుతుందని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఇంతవరకు ఈ Appellate Tribunal యిచ్చిన, మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రానికి సంబంధించినటువంటి, తీర్పులన్నియు రద్దచేసి తిరిగి విచారణకు పెట్టటానికి ఆవకాశములు కల్పించవలసినదిగా మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. భీరం I.L.T.D. Company మేనేజిమెంటుకు కార్మికులకు వచ్చిన తగాదాల విషయంలోనూడా లేబరు కమిషనరు జోక్యము వున్నానుటవల్ల ఆక్రమ కార్మికులు చాలాకాలం గరికావలసి వచ్చిందని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. లేబరు కమిషనరు హామీకి వ్యతిరేకంగా యూనియన్ నాయకులను మేనేజిమెంటు డిస్మిస్

[Sri K. Ranga Rao]

[26th July 1952]

చేసింది. తర్వాత గుంటూరు జిల్లా చిలకలూరిపేటలో పున్న కార్మికులు అందరు ఒక Union ను ఏర్పరచుకొని వారి కష్టాలను యజమానులకు చెప్పుకోగా ఆ నాయకులందరినీ dismiss చేశారు. ఆ నాయకులు ఆ కంపెనీ కార్మికులు అనేకసార్లు యీ విషయంలో విన్నపములు పంపినను ఆ సమస్య యింతవరకూ పరిష్కారము కాకుండా పోవడము ఆనేది యీ లేబరు డిపార్టుమెంటు అసమర్థతను తెలుపుతు లేదా? ఈ Labour Department ఉద్యోగస్తులను యజమానులు తమ చేతులలో tools గా చేసికొని వారికి ప్రభుత్వముతో కావలసియున్న పనులను నెరవేర్చుకొంటూఉన్నారు. ఈ విషయములో యీ ప్రభుత్వము ఆనుసరిస్తున్న విధానమేటిలో గమనించగోరుచున్నాను. ఇదంతాదూస్తే కార్మికులకు అన్యాయం చేయడముకాక మరేమిటని అడుగుచున్నాను. ఇట్టి పరిస్థితులలో (1) పారిశ్రామిక Tribunals తీర్పు యివ్వడంలో ఆలస్యము చేయకుండా చూడాలన్నది, (2) పారిశ్రామిక తగాదానిన్నూ పారిశ్రామిక tribunal కు పంపడానికి వీలుగా చట్టమును సవరణ చేయాలన్నది, (3) Appellate Tribunals ను రద్దుచేసి, హైకోర్టుకు ఆపీలు సౌకర్యాలు కలిగించుటకునూ, (4) ఈ కార్మిక శాఖోద్యోగులను కార్మిక సమస్యలు తెలిసినవారినే నియమించుటకు సూతన చర్యలు వెంటనే తీసుకోవాలని ప్రభుత్వంవారిని అర్థించుచూనూ, (5) Standing orders ను అనుసరించి పెద్ద పెద్ద కంపెనీలు కార్మికులకు ఎట్టి అన్యాయం చేస్తున్నో అనుభవదృష్టితో సవరించాలని, (6) Standing orders క్రింద అక్రమంగా dismiss చేయబడ్డ బీరాల, చిలకలూరిపేట వి. యచ్. టి. డి. కంపెనీ యూనియన్ లకు చెందిన యూనియన్ నాయకులను పదహారు మందిని శని లోకి తీసుకొనునట్లు అప్రసరచర్య తీసికోవలసినదిగాను (7) యిండస్ట్రియల్ ట్రిబ్యునల్ యిచ్చిన తీర్పును తక్షణం అమలు జరుగునట్లు చట్టంలో అప్రసరచర్యలు చేపల సినదిగాను (8) వ్యవసాయకూలీలకు, పాలేర్లకు కనీస కూలీ, జీతం ఇవ్వించుచున్నూ, పని గంటలు తలపులు యితర రక్షణలు కలిగించుచూ ఒక చట్టము తేవలసినదిగాను కోరుచున్నాను. ప్రైవూవసలు అమలుజరుపుటకు కావలసిన పద్ధతిలో డిమాండు లేనందున వ్యతిరేకించుచున్నాను.”

12-50
p.m.

* SRI A. BALARAMA REDDI:—“Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demand. Before doing so, I should like to say a few words about the Labour Officers employed in the Labour Department. They have miserably failed to enforce the various labour laws of our State. There is again a lot of delay in the settlement of disputes. In the initial stages, the disputes are tried to be settled by conciliation. If conciliation does not succeed, then the disputes are referred to Industrial Tribunals under the Industrial Disputes Act. The decisions of these Industrial Tribunals are not final. In many cases the decisions are not implemented by the capitalists. The workers continue to suffer from want of wages and other comforts. Usually it happens that the labourers are dragged to law Courts by the capitalists, whenever the findings of the Tribunals are against their interests. Till the decisions are announced by the Tribunals, the workers are not paid wages in the interim period. So I would request the Government to reconstitute these Industrial Tribunals and make their decisions final. They should not allow the decisions of these Tribunals to be flouted by the capitalists.

“Next to the Labour Officers come the Labour Inspectors. They are not doing their job well. They are not doing their work

26th July 1952] [Sri A. Balarama Reddi]

in the spirit in which they are expected to do the same. The Labour Inspectors do not come in contact with the labourers. Either they should be given more powers to help these labourers or they should be removed from office. Otherwise it would be a colossal waste of public funds to continue them in office.

"A word about the enforcement of the Minimum Wages Act. The Labour Officers are expected to see that the capitalists enforce the above Act strictly. But what is it that is really happening? I know specific instances wherein this Act had not been properly applied. In my own constituency of Kalahasti in Chittoor district an open abuse of the Act has been made. No notice seems to have been taken by the Government of the same. The labourers in the beedi factories had been clamouring for higher wages. The Minimum Wages Act was made applicable to these factories also. The labourers were assured of a minimum wage of Re. 1-6-6 for rolling 1,000 beedies. But what did the capitalists do? The owners of the factory opened several branches in the names of their own kith and kin and their managers to defeat the purpose of the Minimum Wages Act, and they were paid lesser wages than those fixed under the Act. The number of workers in the factory was reduced to one-fourth of the previous strength. By converting their original factory into several units, the capitalists have not given effect to the Minimum Wages Act, so far as their workers are concerned. Several petitions and mahazars were written to the Labour Commissioner pointing out this anomaly. But it was a cry in the wilderness. Nothing was done towards the improvement of the labourers. This has not only deprived the labourers of their legitimate wages but also affected the revenues of the Government as the profit earned by the employer is now divided amongst the various branches that are only the agents of the employer.

"I shall come to a recent occurrence in Madras City. The workers of a big firm gathered together and clamoured for increased wages. The secretary of that union wrote a letter to the secretary of the firm. The secretary of the firm met one of the big officials in the Labour Department and enquired whether it was necessary for him to give effect to their representations. The official replied to him that the proprietor need not even acknowledge the representation from the workers, and even went to the extent of advising the secretary of the firm to destroy the petitions received from the workers. That is how labour is treated in Madras."

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—"I would like to know from the hon. Member whether this incident has happened in any Government factory. If so, I would like him to give the name of the officer who said that the letter from the labour union need not even be acknowledged."

* **SRI A. BALARAMA REDDI** :—"This did not happen in any Government factory, Sir. I referred to this incident only to show how Officers of the Labour Department are attending to their

[Sri A. Balarama Reddi] [26th July 1952]

duties. They never care for the welfare of labour. They have developed an unsympathetic attitude to the labourers. No doubt Government had with good motive passed the Minimum Wages Act and the Industrial Disputes Act. But when their own officers are not implementing the provisions of certain sections of that Act, what is the use of keeping them in office? I would like the Hon. Minister for Industries to weed out some of these Labour Officers from these departments.

“Before closing, I shall refer to the agricultural labourers. These labourers are paid very low wages. They are ruthlessly exploited by the landlords. I request the Government to standardise their wages. With these observations, I support the Demand.

“Thank you, Sir, for having allowed me this opportunity to speak.”

* **SRI P. JEEVANANDAM** :—“கனம் உதவி தலைவர் அவர்களே, காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்கார் 1946-ம் வருஷத்திலிருந்து 1951-ம் வருஷம் வரையில் சாதித்த சாதனைகளைப்பற்றி ஒரு அருமையான புஸ்தகத்தை வெளியிட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதில் தொழிலாளர்களുടെ பகுதி வருகிறது. அதில் சர்க்காருடைய சாதனைகளைப்பற்றி சொல்லி இருக்கிறார்கள். அதில் சர்க்காரின் தொழில் கொள்கை என்ன என்பதைப்பற்றியும் விளக்கம் சொல்லி இருக்கிறார்கள். நடமாட்டமுறையில் செயல்படும் விதங்களும் வகுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. அதாவது சட்டங்களால் தொழிலாளர்கள் பூர்ணமாகப் பயன்பெற வேண்டும் என்பது ஒன்று. அடுத்தபடியாக அவர்களுடைய நன்மைகளை மேலும் பெருக்க வேண்டும் என்பது இரண்டு. அவசியமான புதிய சட்டங்களைக் கொண்டு வர வேண்டும் என்பது மூன்று. ஆரோக்கிய ரீதியில் தொழிற்சங்க இயக்கம் வளர்வதற்கான உதவி அளிப்பது நான்கு. தொழிலாளர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்தை உயர்த்துவது, தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு வேலையில்லா திண்டாட்டம் இல்லாமல் தொழிலாளர்களை பாதுகாக்க வேண்டுமென்பது ஐந்து. அடுத்தபடியாக தொழிலாளர்களுடைய தகராறுகளைத் தீர்க்கத் தகுந்த ஸ்தாபனங்களை அமைப்பது. இவைகளையெல்லாம் சர்க்கார் தங்களുടെ labour policy-யில் குறிப்பிட்டு பிரசுரம் செய்திருக்கிறார்கள்.

“முதலில் இப்பொழுது நடந்துவரும் விஷயங்களை உங்களுடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன். தங்களையுடைய கொள்கைகளை அமுல் நடத்தும் சர்க்கார் அவைகளை சரிவர நடத்துவது இல்லை. 1946-ம் வருஷம் முதற்கொண்டு 1951-ம் வருஷம் வரையில் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு சர்க்கார் எத்தனையோ சட்டங்களை செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். அவைகள் Industrial Employment Act, Industrial Disputes Act, Factories Act, Shop Assistants Act, Minimum Wages Act என்ற பல சட்டங்களைச் செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். அவற்றை சரியாக அமுல் நடத்திக் கொள்ளுவதென்றால் சரியாக அமுல் நடத்தவில்லை. 1946-ம் வருஷம் முதற்கொண்டு 1951-ம் வருஷம் வரையில் 22,600 தொழில் தகராறுகள் ஏற்பட்டு அதில் 22,260 conciliation-க்கு விடப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. மீதம் 340 தகராறுகள் adjudication செய்யப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. சர்க்காரின் labour policy என்ன? எதற்காக சட்டம் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டது என்பதை கவனிக்கவேண்டும். தொழிலாளர்களைப் பாதுகாப்பதற்கு என்ன செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். சட்டங்களின் லட்சியங்களை சர்க்காரே நடத்தப்படும் தொழில்களிலேயே அமுல் நடத்தப்படவில்லை. இங்கு சர்க்கார் தங்களையுடைய தொழிற் கொள்கையின் லட்சியத்தையும் தொழில் சமாதானத்தையும் சமூகப் பாதுகாப்பையும் நிலை நிறுத்துவது என்கிறார்கள் என்பதை கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

“ஐந்து வருஷ காங்கிரஸ் ஆட்சியின் பின் சென்ற நான்கு மாதங்களாக கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களின் மந்திரி சபை வந்திருக்கிறது. அவர்கள் அனுஷ்டித்து வரும் கொள்கையை உங்களுக்கு முன்னால் வைக்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

26th July 1952] [Sri P. Jeevanandam]

முதலில் சர்க்கார் குறிப்பிடும் கொள்கையை சர்க்காரே நடத்துகின்ற தொழில் களில் அவர்களே அனுஷ்டிக்கிறார்களா வெண்பதை கவனிக்கவேண்டும்.

“அதற்காக சர்க்காரால் நடத்தப்படும் மோட்டார் Transport-ஐ எடுத்துக் கொள்வோம். அதில் வேலைசெய்யும் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு இரண்டு வருஷங்களாக increment கொடுக்கவில்லை. என்னுடைய தொகுதியாகிய வட சென்னையில் சர்க்கார் Transport-ல் வேலை செய்யும் தொழிலாளர்கள் 2,500 பேர்களில் மூன்றில் ஒரு பங்கு தொழிலாளர்கள் வாழ்கின்றார்கள். அவர்கள் சொல்வதைத் தான் நான் இங்கு சொல்லுகிறேன். அவர்கள் தங்களுக்கு இரண்டு வருஷங்களாக increment கிடைக்கவில்லை என்று சொல்லுகின்றார்கள். மற்றும் 18 மாதங்களாக துணியும் கொடுக்கப்படவில்லை என்கின்றார்கள். குறைந்த பட்ச சம்பளம் கூட அவர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்படவில்லை. இந்த குறைந்த பட்ச சம்பளம் conductor, lorry bus driver-கள் யாருக்கும் கொடுக்கப்படவில்லை என்கிறார்கள். அதுமட்டுமல்ல, 8-மணி நேர வேலை செய்யவேண்டுமென்று சர்க்காராலேயே நிர்ணயிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அவ்வகையில் 8-மணி வேலையென்று நிர்ணயிக்கப்பட்டிருந்தும் 14-மணி நேரம் வேலைவாங்குகிறார்கள். அவர்களை காலைவில் அழைத்துப் போவதற்கு (lift-க்கு) பஸ் நாலு மணிக்கு வருகிறது. உடனே தொழிலாளர்கள் அந்த பஸ்ஸில் போய்விட வேண்டும். ஆனால் அவர்கள் 5-மணி, 5½-மணி, 6-மணி, 6½-மணி, 7-மணி, 7½-மணிக்கு தான் மெய்யாகவே வேலையில் ஈடுபடுகிறார்கள். அது வரையில் அவர்கள் காா ஷெட்டிலேயே இருக்கவேண்டும். பஸ் ஒடுகின்ற நேரம் தான் கணக்கு. நிற்கின்ற நேரத்தைக் கணக்கில் சேர்ப்பதில்லை. இதை singles என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இதன்படி 20-லிருந்து 40, 45 singles வரை ஓட்டுகிறார்கள். இந்தக் கணக்கின்படி பார்த்தால் அந்தத் தொழிலாளர்கள் பஸ் ஓட்டுவது எட்டு மணி நேரம் வேலைதான். ஆனாலும் மொத்தத்தில் 14-மணி நேரம் வேலை பார்க்கின்றார்கள் என்பது தெரியவரும்.

“அதன் பிறகு Checking Inspector இருக்கிறார். அவர் கட்டாயமாக ஒரு மாதத்திற்கு ஐந்து கேஸ்கள் கண்டுபிடித்து கேஸ் போடவேண்டும். அவ் விதம் உத்தரவு இருக்கிறது என்பதை உங்களுடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வர விரும்புகிறேன். அத்துடன் ஏற்கனவே recruit பண்ணிய conductor களில் நூறுக்கு 75 பேர்கள் dismiss செய்யப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். சர்க்காரின் கணக்குப்படி இந்த தொழிலில் வந்திருக்கக்கூடிய லாபம் பத்து லட்சத்திற்கு மேல் பதிவான முறையில் கணக்குப் போட்டால் ரூ. 45 லட்சத்திற்குக் குறையாமல் வரும் என்று நான் சொல்லுகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக Corporation-ஐ எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் அங்கே சுமார் பத்தாயிரம் தொழிலாளர்கள் வேலை செய்கின்றார்கள். 40 ரூபாய்க்கு கீழ் சம்பளம் வாங்குகிறவர்களுக்கு சர்க்கார் வீட்டு வாடகைக்கு என்று ஏழு ரூபாய் வீட்டு வாடகை கொடுக்கிறபொழுது இதையே மிகக் கொஞ்சம் என்கிறோம். Corporation-ல் நான்கு ரூபாய் கொடுக்கின்றார்கள். இந்த நான்கு ரூபாயை வைத்துக்கொண்டு ஏழைத் தொழிலாளி என்ன செய்ய முடியும்?

“அதற்கடுத்தபடியாக சர்க்காரால் நிர்ணயிக்கப்பட்ட கொள்கைகள் அமுல் நடத்தப்படும் தொழிற்சாலைகளின் விஷயத்தைக் கவனிப்போம். வட சென்னையிலுள்ள பீடி தொழிலாளர்களை எடுத்துக் கொள்வோம். சட்டத்தை மீறும் பீடித் தொழிலில் முதலாளிகள் மீது தக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்படுமா? என்று ஒரு கேள்வி கேட்கப்பட்டபொழுது கனம் மந்திரி ஸ்ரீ U. கிருஷ்ண ராவ் பதில் சொல்லியிருக்கிறார். ‘நான் என்ன சொல்வது, சட்டத்தில் இடம் இல்லை’ என்று. பீடி தொழிலில் பாக்கிரி சட்டம் மீறப்படுவது சகஜமாக இருக்கிறது. பீடித் தொழிலில் சுமார் பத்தாயிரம் பேர்களுக்கு மேல் வேலை செய்கிறார்கள். அவ்வளவு பேர்களுக்கும் ஒழுங்காக வேலை கிடைப்பதில்லை. வாரத்திற்கு இரண்டு நாளைகளுக்குக் கூட வேலை கிடைப்பதில்லை. திடீர் திடீரென்று வேலை நிறுத்தமும் கதவடைப்பும் நடக்கின்றன. பாக்கிரி சட்டத்தை மீறுவதற்காக அநேக பிரஞ்சுகளை திறந்து வைத்து பாக்கிரி சட்டத்திலிருந்து மீறுகிறார்கள். அநேகம் பிரஞ்சுகள் வைத்திருப்பதால் தொழிற்சாலை சட்டத்திலிருந்து தப்பித்துக் கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். கரீம் பீடித் தொழிற்சாலை, டாஜ்மகால் பீடி தொழிற்சாலை போன்ற பெரிய பீடி தொழிற்சாலைகளில் இவ்விதம் நடைபெறுகின்றன.

[Sri P. Jeevanandam]

[26th July 1952]

“அடுத்தாற்போல் Tramways-ஐ எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் இந்த 4, 5 வருஷங்களில் அநேகம் adjudication நடந்திருக்கின்றன. காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்காரின் labour policy தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு அனுசூலமாகவே இல்லை. இரண்டு வருஷமாக adjudication நடந்தது. ஏழை தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு மிகவும் கஷ்டம். கீழ் கோர்ட்டு, மேல் கோர்ட்டு, பம்பாய் ஹைக் கோர்ட்டு, சென்னை ஹைக் கோர்ட்டு இப்படி பல கோர்ட்டுகளுக்குப் போய் வந்தன. இந்த மாதிரி கோர்ட்டுகளுக்குப் போய் வருவதைவிட ஏழும்பலயான் தெரிசனத்துக்குப் போய் வருவது சலபம். இவ்வளவு தொல்லைகளிலும் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட 40, 50 தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு எவ்வளவு கஷ்டம். பணச் செலவிற்கு என்ன செய்வார்கள்?

“அதற்கடுத்தாற்போல் இந்த நகரத்திலுள்ள ஹோட்டல் தொழிலாளர்கள் பற்றி ஒரு வாரத்தை, அம்பீல் கட்டீயின் தகராறு நான்கு மாதங்களாக நடந்து வருகின்றன. Conciliation கணக்கில் சேர்ப்பதாகவே இல்லை. அது பற்றி சர்க்காரும் எவ்வித effective action-ம் எடுத்துக் கொள்ளவில்லை. மீண்டும் conciliation-க்கு முயற்சி செய்யப்போகிறார்களாம். சமீப காலமாக ஹோட்டல் தொழிலாளர்களுடைய நிலைமை ரொம்பவும் பரிதாபகரமாக இருக்கிறது. தொழிலாளர்கள் முதலாளிகளை சிறிது வசதி கேட்டுவிட்டால் போதும் உடனே போலீசைக் கூப்பிடுகிறார்கள். அவ்விதம் கூப்பிட்டு சமீபத்தில் 30, 32 ஹோட்டல் தொழிலாளர்கள் ஜெயிலுக்குப் போயிருக்கிறார்கள். கேரளா பவன், லட்சுமி பவன், லலிதா லட்சு ஹோம் முதலிய ஹோட்டல்களில் தகராறுகள் நடந்து வருகின்றன.

“அடுத்தபடியாக tannery works இந்த மாகாணத்திலேயே அது ஒரு சிறந்த தொழில். ஹரிஜனங்களுக்கு பிரமாதமாக பாடுபடுகிறோம் என்று சர்க்கார் சொல்லுகிறார்களே அந்த ஹரிஜனங்களுடைய முக்கியமான தொழில் இந்த tannery தொழில். இந்தத் தொழிலில் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான தொழிலாளர்கள் வேலை செய்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்குக் குறைந்த பட்ச சம்பளம் கூட கொடுக்கப்படவே இல்லை. அவர்களுக்கு எட்டண கூலி கொடுக்கிறார்கள். ஒரு பிச்சைக்காரனுக்குக் கொடுக்கும் காசு கூட இல்லை. ஆயிரக்கணக்கானபேர் வேலையிழந்து தெருவில் நிற்கிறார்கள். இதில் கொஞ்சம் கவனம் செலுத்தவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லிக் கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக ஹார்பர் தொழிலாளிகள். அங்கே பத்தாயிரம் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு மேல் இருக்கிறார்கள். பெரும்பாலோர் temporary தொழிலாளர்களாக இருக்கின்றார்கள். தினக்கூலி முறை அமல் நடக்கிறது. டீக் ஒடிந்து, கால் ஒடிந்து போனவர்களுக்கு நஷ்டயீடு இல்லை. கடலில் விழுந்து நான்கு நாட்கள் கழித்து பிரேதத்தைக் கரையில் கண்ட பிறகுதான் கவனிக்கப்படுகிறது. இவ்வளவு பரிதாபம் ஹார்பர் தொழிலாளர்களின் நிலைமை.

“அதைப்போலவே வட சென்னையிலுள்ள Aluminium Factory, Premier Metal Factory. இங்கே அவ்வன்ஸ் குறைக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. கூலி உயர்வு, போனஸ் இல்லை. அங்கே தொழிலாளர்களை பழிவாங்குகிறார்கள். ஆட்களை குறைக்கப்படுகிறது. ஜீவன்வால் பாக்கிரி இருக்கிறது. இங்குவேலைபளு அதிகரிக்கப் படுகிறது. வேலை செய்வதற்குத் தக்க கூலி கொடுப்பது இல்லை. 180 தொழிலாளிகளுக்கு வேலையில்லை யென்றும் விரட்டப்படுகிறார்கள்.

“அப்பால் சுருட்டுத் தொழில். இதுவும் பீடித் தொழிலைப் போலத்தான். திடீர் திடீரென்று வேலை நிறுத்தம் செய்யப்படுகிறது. போனஸ் கிடையாது. கதவடைப்பு வேறு நடக்கிறது. இவ்விதம் இருக்கிறது நமது சர்க்காரின் labour policy. நடைமுறையில் பார்க்கும்போது அனுசூலம் ஒன்றும் கிடைத்து வருவதாக இல்லை. சென்னை Glass Factory—அங்கும் அதே மாதிரிதான் தொழிலாளர்களுடைய கஷ்டம் சொல்லமுடியாது. அடுத்தாற்போல் Thompson Press. அங்கு இரண்டு வருஷமாக தொழிலாளர்களை பழிவாங்கப்படுகிறது. Labour Department அதிகாரிகளிடமும் தொழில் மந்திரியிடமும் நடந்து நடந்து காலும் தேய்ந்து விட்டது, சொல்லிச்சொல்லி வாயும் சலித்துவிட்டது. 10, 13 கேஸ்களில் திருப்பத் திருப்ப கோர்ட்டுக்குக் கொண்டு போயும் adjudication கிடைத்த பாடிஸ்டை என்று சொல்லும்

26th July 1952] [Sri P. Jeevanandam]

நிலமையிலிருக்கிறது. அடுத்தாற்போல் M.E.S.C. தொழிலாளர்கள் அதில் ஒன்றிரண்டு வருஷங்களுக்கு மேல் வேலை பார்த்தும் இன்னும் temporary-யாகத்தானிருக்கின்றார்கள்.

“கடைசியாக சென்னையிலுள்ள மீன் பிடிக்கும் தொழிலாளர்கள். இது மிகவும் செழிப்பான தொழில். மிகவும் சிறந்த தொழில். மீன் பிடிப்பவர்களுக்கு வசதி செய்யப்படவே இல்லை. உணவு பற்றாக்குறையை பூர்த்தி செய்யக்கூடிய தொழில். இது ஒரு குடிசைத் தொழில். இராயபுரத்திலுள்ள குடிசைகளை கடல் அறுத்துக்கொண்டு போகிறது. தண்டையார் பேட்டையிலிருப்பவர்களில் பலர் வீடிழந்திருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு அந்த வசதியும், மீன்பிடிப்பதற்கு நூல் வாங்கிக் கொடுத்தும், கட்டு மரம் வாங்கிக் கொடுத்தும் வசதி செய்து கொடுக்கவேண்டும். இது வரையிலும் ஒன்றும் செய்வதாகவே இல்லை. ஒன்றும் கவனிப்பதாகவே இல்லை.”

* SRI M. S. MUNISAMI PILLAY :—“கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர் களை! கனம் தொழில் மந்திரி அவர்கள் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கின்ற மான் யத்தை நான் ஆதரிக்கின்றேன். அதோடு தொழிலாளர்கள் சம்பந்தப் பட்ட சில விஷயங்களையும் சர்க்காருடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வருகிறேன். 1-10 p.m.

“இன்றைய தினம் நம்முடைய சர்க்கார் தொழிலாளர்கள் விஷயத்தில் அக்கறை செலுத்தி மிகக் குறைந்த காலத்தில் பல நல்ல சட்டங்களைக் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். குறிப்பாக ஷாப் சட்டம் இன்றைக்கு அமுல் நடத்தப்படுகிறது. இது காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்கார் செய்திருக்கும் ஒரு நல்ல சட்டமாகும். இந்தச் சட்டம் இன்றைக்கு அமுல் நடத்தப்படுகிற விஷயத்தில் சில தவறுகள் இருக்கின்றன. இதை அமுல் நடத்தக்கூடிய விஷயத்தில் தொழிலாளருக்கோ, அல்லது கடை முதலாளிகளுக்கோ ஒரு விதமான பிரயோஜனமுமில்லை. ஆகவே இரு சாராரும் அனுபவிக்கக் கூடிய முறையில் ஒரு கமிட்டியை அமைத்து இந்தச் சட்டத்தைத் திருத்தி, நல்ல முறையில் இதை அமுல் நடத்தவேண்டுமென்பதாக நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக இன்றைக்கு மோட்டார் தொழிலாளருக்கு குறைந்த பக்க சம்பளம் இருக்கிறது. ஆனால் பல மோட்டார் கம்பெனிகளில் இதை அமுல் நடத்துவதில்லை. இதை அமுல் நடத்துவதற்கு மோட்டார்களுக்குப் பர்மிட் வழங்கும்பொழுதே குறைந்த பட்ச சம்பள விதித்ததை அவர்கள் அமுல் நடத்தவேண்டுமென்று வற்புறுத்தி அப்படிச் செய்வதாயிருந்தால் தான் பர்மிட் வழங்கப்படுமென்றால் அவர்கள் நிச்சயம் அதை ஒழுங்காக நிறைவேற்றிவைப்பார்கள் என்று நான் அபிப்பிராயப்படுகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக சுருட்டுத் தொழிலாளர்கள், பீடித் தொழிலாளர்கள் இன்று பட்டக்கூடிய கஷ்டங்களில் பற்றி பலர் சொன்னார்கள். இந்தக் குறைகள் இருப்பதற்கு ஓரளவு அரசியல் கிளர்ச்சிகள்தான் காரணமென்று நான் அபிப்பிராயப்படுகிறேன். தொழிலாளருக்கு இருக்கக் கூடிய ஒரு சில குறைகளை வைத்துக்கொண்டு இவர்களை பெரிய வேலை நிறுத்தங்களுக்குக் கொண்டுபோய் விடுகிறது அதனால் ஏற்படக்கூடிய கஷ்டங்களால் தான் என்று பெரும்பாலான தொழிலாளர்கள் சிக்கலில் மாட்டிக்கொண்டுவருதிப் படுகிறார்கள். குறிப்பாகச் சொல்லுகிறேன். இன்று சுருட்டு, பீடி, புகையிலை தொழிற்சாலைகளில் அவர்கள் ஆயிரம் சுருட்டு சுற்றினால் இவ்வளவு கூலி என்று நிர்ணயிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறதே தவிர இவ்வளவு மணி நேரம் வேலை செய்தால் இவ்வளவு கூலி என்று நிர்ணயிக்கப்படவில்லை. இந்த இடங்களில் பாக்கரி சட்டத்தை அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டு வந்ததினால் தான் தொழிலாளர்களும் அதிக நேரம் வேலை செய்துஅதிக ஆயிரம் சுருட்டுகளைச் சுற்ற முடியவில்லை என்று கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள். அதே போல முதலாளிகளும் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள். என்னுடைய ஊர் சம்பந்தப்பட்டவரை பல பகுதிகளில் தொழிலாளர்கள் இந்த பாக்கரி ஆக்டினால் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள். இது இல்லாவிட்டால் வேலைக்குத் தகுந்த கூலியை அவர்கள் வாங்கிக் கொள்வதற்கு இடமுண்டு. அதே நேரத்தில் அதிக உற்பத்தியைச் செய்

[Sri M. S. Munisami Pillay] [26th July 1952]

வதற்கும் முதலாளிகளுக்குச் சந்தர்ப்பம் உண்டு. ஆகையால் இந்த சட்டத்தை திருத்தி அமைக்கவேண்டுமென்றே நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக தோல் பதனிடும் தொழில். இந்தத் தொழிலுக்கும் சர்க்கார் குறைந்த பட்ச கூலியை நிர்ணயம் செய்து அவர்கள் வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்திற்கு வேண்டிய எல்லா வசதிகளையும் செய்து கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக தொழில் கோர்ட்டில் கொடுக்கப்படும் அவார்களை சில முதலாளிகள் சரிவர அமுல் நடத்துவதில்லை. தொழில் கோர்ட்டுகளில் கொடுக்கப்படும் தீர்ப்பு தங்களுக்குச் சாதகமாக இருந்தால் தான் முதலாளிகள் அதை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். ஆகையால் எந்த முடிவாக இருந்தாலும் தொழில் கோர்ட்டில் கொடுக்கப்படும் முடிவுகளை அமுல் நடத்தும்படி பார்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். அந்த அவார்களை முதலாளிகள் தொழிலாளருக்குக் கொடுத்தே தீரவேண்டும். தொழில் கோர்ட்டினால் இன்று தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு இருக்கக் கூடிய நன்மைகளை சர்க்கார் பாதுகாக்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இப்படிச் செய்வதினால் தொழிலாளர்கள் எப்பொழுதும் அதிகப்பதியின்றி வேலை செய்யக் கூடியவர்களாகவே வைத்திருக்கலாம் என்று நான் அபிப்பிராயப்படுகிறேன்.

“நீர்க் இன்றைக்கு தொழிற்சாலைகளில் திடீர் திடீர் என்று வேலை நிறுத்தம் ஏற்படுகிறது. காரணக்காரணமில்லாமல் தொழிலாளர்கள் வேலை நிறுத்தம் செய்வதற்கு அடிப்படை காரணமென்ன என்று நாம் பார்க்க வேண்டும். இம்மாதிரி ஏற்படாமல் இருப்பதற்காக ஸ்ரீமான் குப்புசாமி அவர்கள் சொன்ன யோசனையை நானும் ஒத்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். அதாவது ஒரு தொழிற்சாலை இருந்தால் அதன் லாப நஷ்ட புள்ளி விவரங்களை அடிக்கடி பேப்பரிலே பிரசுரித்து விட்டால் பொது மக்களும் அங்கேயே வேலை செய்கின்ற தொழிலாளர்களும் தொழிற்சாலைக்கு எவ்வளவு லாபம் கிடைத்தது? அல்லது எவ்வளவு நஷ்டம் ஏற்பட்டது. முதலாளிகள் தங்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கும் சம்பளம் சரிதானா? இல்லை நம்மை ஏமாற்றிவிட்டு அவன் கொள்ளை லாபம் கொண்டு போகிறான்”, என்ற விஷயங்களைப் புரிந்துகொண்டு விடுவார்கள். ஒருவரை ஒருவர் நன்றாகப் புரிந்துகொண்டு விட்டால் பின்னால் திடீரென்று எந்தத் தகராறும் ஏற்படுவதற்கு வசதியிருக்காது. முதலாளியே அதிகமாக தனக்கு லாபம் வந்திருக்கிறதென்று போனால் கொடுக்காவிட்டால் என்ன ஏற்படுமோ என்று பயப்படுவான்.

“ஆகையால் நான் சொன்ன விஷயங்களிலெல்லாம் சர்க்கார் கவனம் செலுத்த வேண்டுமென்பதாகக் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என் பேச்சை முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

*SRI M. PALANIANDI —“கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கனம் தொழில் மந்திரி அவர்கள் கொண்டு வந்த தொழில் மானியக் கோரிக்கையை எதிர்த்து, வெட்டுப் பிரேரணையை ஆதரித்துப் பேச விரும்புகின்றேன்.

“எனக்கு முன் பேசிய அங்கத்தினர்கள், ‘உண்மையாக தொழிற் சட்டங்கள் சரியாக நிறைவேற்றப்படவில்லை, அவைகளெல்லாம் எட்டளவில் தான் இருக்கின்றன’ வென்று சொன்னார்கள். உண்மையாக, ‘Minimum Wages Act’ இயற்றினார்கள். நடைமுறையில் அது கொண்டுவிடப்படாதா என்றால் கிடைப்பாது. ஏதோ சில இடங்களில் கொண்டுவிடப்பட்டிருக்கலாம். இப்பொழுது கொடுக்கப்படும் சம்பளத்திலும் கூட குறைவாக இருக்கிறதே தவிர, உண்மையாக ஒரு தொழிலாளி வாழக்கூடிய நிலையில் சம்பளம் நிர்ணயிக்கப்படவில்லை. சாதாரண தொழிலாளிகளுக்கு குறைந்த சம்பளம் நிர்ணயிக்கப்படவில்லை. சென்னை நகரத்திலுள்ள கார்ப்பரேஷன் தொழிலாளிகளுக்கென ஒரு சிறு கமிட்டி அமைத்தார்கள். திரு. வெங்கட் ராமனும், இன்னும் சிலரும் அந்தக் கமிட்டியில் இருக்கிறார்கள். எல்லோரும் ஏகமனதாக ஒரே தீர்ப்பளித்தும் கூட, அந்தத் தீர்ப்பை உடனடி

26th July 1952]

[Sri M. Palaniandi]

யாக நடை முறைக்குக் கொண்டுவருவதற்கு இந்த அரசாங்கம் முன் வரவில்லை. ஆகையால், என்ன கமிட்டி அமைத்தாலும் சரி, யார் யார் அதில் அங்கத்தினர்களாக இருந்தாலும் சரி, அந்தத் தீர்ப்பை சரிவர அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவராததன் காரணத்தினால் தான் இன்று தொழிலாளிகளிடையே அமைதியில்லாமல் இருக்கிறது.

“இந்திய தேசிய தொழிற் சங்க காங்கிரசில் தமிழ் நாட்டு அங்கத்தினர் நான். ஷோஷலிஸ்ட் கட்சி நண்பர்கள் சொல்லலாம், பிற்போக்கு ஸ்தாபனம் என்று. கம்யூனிஸ்டுகள் பிற்போக்கு ஸ்தாபனம் என்று சொல்லலாம். உண்மையாக, எந்தெந்த தொழிற்சங்கங்களில் யார் யார் வேலை செய் தாலும் கூட, அவர்கள் உண்மையாக கோரிக்கைகளைக் கேட்டாலுங் கூட, எப்படியாவது அதை புறக்கணித்துவிட்டு, நசுக்கிவிட வேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணம் அரசாங்கத்திற்கு இருக்கிறதே தவிர, உண்மையாக அந்தக் கோரிக்கைகளைப் பரிசீலனை செய்து, காரியங்களையாற்ற முன் வருவதில்லை அரசாங்கம்.

“இன்ஷூரன்ஸ் சட்டம் கொண்டுவரவேண்டுமென்று சொன்னார்கள். ஒன்னை மாகாணத்தில் உடனடியாகக் கொண்டுவரமுடியும். போதிய டாக்டர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். சட்ட பூர்வமாக இருக்கக்கூடிய தொழிற் சங்கங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. உடனடியாக இன்ஷூரன்ஸ் சட்டம் கொண்டுவர வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.

“Conciliation Proceedings-ஐ எடுத்துக்கொண்டால், உதாரணமாக பல நாள் ஆகின்றது. கான்விலியேஷன் ஆபீசர் தன்னுடைய சிபார்சை இங்கு கமிஷனருக்கு அனுப்புகின்றார். கான்விலியேஷன் ஆபீசர் பூர்வாங்கமாகப் பரிசீலனை செய்து சொல்லியும், கமிஷனர் அதைத் தள்ளி விடுகிறார். அல்லது தொழில் கோர்ட்டுகள் வேண்டுமென்றும், மேலுள்ள அதிகாரிகள் உடனடியாகக் கொடுப்பதில்லை. வீண் சாக்குப்போக்கு சொல்லு கிறார்கள். முதலில் யார் வருகிறார்களோ அவர்களுக்கு நியாயம் கொடுக் கிறார்கள். அது டால்மியா கிரவாகத்திற்கு மிகவும் பொருந்தும். முதலில் மானேஜ்மெண்டார் வந்துவிட்டால் அவர்கள் பக்கம் சாதகமாக நியாயம் இருக்கிறது. தொழிலாளிகள் பிறகு வந்தால் அவர்களுக்கு நியாயம் கிடைப்பதில்லை.

“1949-ம் ஆண்டில் டால்மியா தொழிலாளிகள் ஒரு சிறு தொழிற் கோர்ட்டு வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டார்கள். முதலில் கமிஷனர்கள் ஒரு தீர்ப்பு கொடுத்தார்கள். அவற்றில் சில நல்ல தீர்ப்பு என்று வைத்துக்கொண் டாலும், அதற்கு மேற்கொண்டு எங்களுக்குப் போனால் வேண்டும், இன்னும் கொஞ்சம் கஷ்டங்கள் இருக்கின்றன, அதனால் தொழில் கோர்ட்டு வேண்டுமென்று பல தடவைகள் நாங்கள் கேட்டோம். ஆனால், கொடுக்க வில்லை. அதன் மேல் வேலை நிறுத்தம் ஏற்பட்டது. அதை illegal strike என்று சொல்லி எங்களுக்குத் தந்தி வந்தது. உடனடியாக Employment Exchange விருந்து தொழிலாளிகள் வருகிறார்கள். எம்பிளாய்மெண்ட் எக்ஸ்சேஞ்சு ஆபீஸ்கள் எப்படி வேலை செய்கிறது என்பது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரிந்த விஷயம். மானேஜ்மெண்டார் புதிதாக தொழிலாளிகளை வேலைக்கு எடுத்துக்கொள்ளும்போது, எம்பிளாய்மெண்ட் எக்ஸ்சேஞ்சுக்கு வேலைக்காரர்கள் வேண்டுமென்று தகவல் கொடுக்கிறார்களா? எம்பிளாய் மெண்ட் எக்ஸ்சேஞ்சு சிபார்சு செய்யும் ஆகளை மானேஜ்மெண்டார் வேலைக்கு வைத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று அவர்களைக் கேட்டுக் கொண்டும், மானேஜ்மெண்டார் சரியாக நடந்துகொள்வதில்லை. மானேஜ்மெண்டாரின் போக்கு சாதாரண காலங்களில் எம்மாதிரி இருக்கிறது என்று ஆபீசர்களுக்குத் தெரியும். தெரிந்திருந்தும், தொழி லாளர்கள் நியாயமான கோக்கைகளுக்காக வேலை நிறுத்தம் செய்தால், அதை மானேஜ்மெண்டார் illegal strike என்று சொல்லும்போது இந்த எம்பிளாய்மெண்ட் எக்ஸ்சேஞ்சு ஆபீசர்கள் இருக்கிறார்களே, அவர்கள், தங்களிடம் பதிவு செய்துகொண்ட தொழிலாளர்களை வேண்டிய அளவு அனுப்பிவைக்கின்றார்கள். மற்றும் டால்மியா தொழிலாளிகள் நியாய மான கோரிக்கைகளுக்காக வேலை நிறுத்தம் செய்யும்போது, கமிஷனர் சட்ட விரோதமான வேலை நிறுத்தம் என்று முதலில் தந்தி அடித்து

[Sri M. Palaniandi]

[26th July 1952]

பின்னர் வேண்டப்படாத வேலை நிறுத்தம் என்று சொல்லுகிறபொழுது வேறு தொழிலாளர்கள் அங்கு வேலைக்குப்போகும்போது, அவர்களைப் பார்த்து, “என்ன ஐயா, நாங்கள் நியாயமான வேலை நிறுத்தம் செய்யும் போது, நீங்கள் எங்களுக்கு எதிராக வேலைக்குப் போகலாமா?” என்று கேட்டு, அவர்களை வேலைக்குப் போகாமல் தடுத்தவிட்டால், போலீஸ்காரர்கள் துப்பாக்கிப் பிரயோகம் செய்கிறார்கள். அதனால், எவ்வளவோ உயிர்கள் சேதம் அடைய சந்தர்ப்பம் கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது. இதை அறிவாரா கமிஷனர்! அஹிம்சைக் கொள்கையையுடைய காங்கிரஸ் என்று சொல்லிக் கொள்பவர்கள் போலீஸ்காரர்களை விட்டு இம்மாதிரி டால்மியா தொழிலாளர்களை இம்சை செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். தொழில் கோர்ட்டு, கிடைத்து, எங்களுக்கு ஏதோ கிடைத்தது. தொழில் கோர்ட்டு கிடைத்தாலும், அப்பெல்லட் ட்ரிபுனலுக்கு நாங்கள் போனாலும், டால்மியா முதலாளிகள் சுப்ரீம் கோர்ட்டு வரையில் போக கங்கனம் கட்டுகிறார்கள். 1949-ல் கொடுத்த தீர்ப்பு இன்னும் நிறைவேற்றப்படாமல் திண்டாடிக்கொண்டிருக்கிறோம்.

“நான் சொல்லுவது என்னவென்றால், கான்சிலியேஷன் ஆபீசர்களானாலும் சரி, தொழில் கோர்ட்டு அதிகாரிகளானாலும் சரி, அவர்கள் திறந்த மனதோடு விசாரித்து, தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு நல்லது செய்யவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்தில் உண்மையாக அளித்த தீர்ப்பை முதலாளிகள் நிறைவேற்ற வேண்டுமென்று கட்டாயப்படுத்தினாலொழிய முதலாளிகள்—தொழிலாளர்களிடையே சமூகமான உறவு ஏற்படமுடியாது. அரசாங்கம் முதலாளிகளைக் கட்டாயப்படுத்துவதைத் தவிர வேறு வழியில்லை. ஏனென்றால், டால்மியாபோன்றவர்கள் வடநாட்டிலிருந்து வந்து இங்குமுதல் போட்டு தொழில் நடத்துகிறார்கள். ஆகையால், இங்கிருக்கும் தொழிலாளர்களை அவர்கள் சரிவர நடத்தவேண்டும். அவர்களுடைய நியாயமான கோரிக்கைகளை கவனிக்கவேண்டும். ஆனால், அவர்கள் தொழிலாளர்களின் நன்மையைப் புறக்கணிப்பதற்கு காரணம் அவர்கள் தமிழ் நாட்டிலுள்ள காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்கு சிமெண்டு ஏஜென்ஸி கொடுத்திருக்கிறோம் என்ற தைரியத்தினால்தான். காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்கு சிமெண்டு ஏஜென்ஸி முதலியவைகள் கொடுத்திருப்பதினால் அரசாங்கம் தங்களை ஒன்றும் செய்ய முடியாது என்று அவர்கள் நினைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுடைய மிரட்டல்களுக்கு நாங்கள் பணிவதில்லை. இருந்தாலும் தொழிலாளர்கள் தங்கள் கோரிக்கைக்காக பொறுமையுடன் போராடிய பிறகுதான் கருணையற்ற முதலாளிகள் பணிந்து வருகிறார்கள்.

1-20-
p.m. “அப்பெல்லட் ட்ரிபுனல் (தொழில் கோர்ட்டு) எப்படி நடக்கின்றன என்று பார்த்தால், மதுரையில் (Madurai dress manufacturing company) விஷயமாக அப்பெல்லட் ட்ரிபுனல் ஒரு தீர்ப்பு தந்திருக்கிறது. அப்பெல்லட் ட்ரிபுனலுக்குப்போய்கூட “இன்ஜன்ஷன்” மறுக்கப்பட்டது. இதுவரையில் முதலாளிகள் தீர்ப்பை நடைமுறையில் நிறைவேற்றவில்லை. ஆனால், முதலாளிகள் சிறைக்குப்ப்படவில்லை. அதே சமயத்தில் திருநெல்வேலியில் ஒரு தொழிற்சாலையில் தொழிலாளிகள் வேலை நிறுத்தம் செய்ததில் அதை (illegal strike) என்று சொல்லி ஒரு தொழிலாளிக்கு மூன்று மாத சிறை தண்டனையும் ரூ. 100 அபராதமும் விதிக்கப்பட்டது.

“கோயமுத்தூரிலுள்ள 30 மில்களில் வேலை செய்யும் தொழிலாளிகள் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட விஷயமாகத் தீர்ப்பு அளிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அந்தத் தீர்ப்பின் பேரில் முதலாளிகள் மேல் கோர்ட்டில் ஒரு இன்ஜன்ஷன் கேட்டார்கள். அது மறுக்கப்பட்டது. இரண்டு மாத போனவிற்கு மட்டும் இன்ஜன்ஷன் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது. அவர்களுக்கு வேண்டிய சம்பளம், பஞ்சப்படி, கிராசவடி வேலையிலிருந்து நீக்கப்பட்ட தொழிலாளிக்கு காம்பென்ஸேஷன் இவைகளைல்லாம் கேட்போது அதற்கு இன்ஜன்ஷன் கொடுக்கவில்லை. 30 ஆயிரம் மில் தொழிலாளிகள் தீர்ப்பின்படி தங்களுடைய கோரிக்கைகளை நிறைவேற்ற வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டால், “நீங்கள் தனித்தனியாக தொழில் கோர்ட்டுக்கு உங்களுடைய அப்ளிகேஷனைக் கொடுத்து, தீர்ப்பு வாங்கிக்கொள்ளுங்கள்” என்று முதலாளிகள் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இந்த 30 ஆயிரம் மில் தொழிலாளிகள் அப்பீல் செய்து கொள்வதற்குப் பணம் எங்கிருக்கின்றது?

26th July 1952]

[Sri M. Palaniandi]

மேலும் திருநெல்வேலி ஜில்லாவில் மாஞ்சேலை எஸ்டேட் என்று ஒரு எஸ்டேட் இருக்கிறது. அங்கிருக்கும் வெள்ளையனால் ஒரு தொழிலாளி வேலை மிலிருந்து நீக்கப்பட்டான். அரசியல் சட்டத்தில் வழங்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் ஜீவாதார உரிமை அவனுக்குத் தடுக்கப்படுகிறது. அந்தத் தொழிலாளி வீட்டுக்கு வந்து மனைவியுடன் இருக்கக்கூடாது என்று அவனுக்கு உத்திரவு பிறப்பிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. கணவனை அந்த மனைவி வீட்டுக்குவர அனுமதித்தால், அவனையும் வேலையிலிருந்து நீக்கிவிடுவோம் என்று அந்த வெள்ளையன் அவளுக்கும் உத்திரவு அனுப்பியிருக்கிறான். இம்மாதிரி அவர்கள் பிரிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இததான் நம்முடைய அரசாங்கத்தில் அரசியல் சட்டத்தில் நமக்கு கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் ஜீவாதார உரிமை.

“ஆண்டுதோறும் மின்சார வெட்டினால் அனேக தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு வேலையில்லாமலிருக்கிறது. மின்சார வெட்டினால் வேலை கிடைக்காத தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு யாதொரு விதமான காம்பென்சேஷனும் மாணேஜ்மெண்டார் கொடுப்பதில்லை. மின்சார வெட்டினால், அவர்களுக்கு வேலை அளிக்க முடியவில்லையென்று மாணேஜ்மெண்டார் சொல்லமுடியாமல் அரசாங்கம் வேறு வழியிலும் இதற்கு உதவி செய்யலாம். அதாவது தெர்மல் ஸ்டேஷனைக் கட்டிக்கொடுத்து மின்சார வெட்டில்லாமல் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு வேலை கிடைக்கும்படி அரசாங்கம் செய்து கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.

“கடைசியாக உண்மையாக தொழிலாளர்களிடையே சமாதானம் நிலவ வேண்டுமென்றால், ஆங்காங்கே ஒவ்வொரு தொழிற்சாலைக்கும் ஒரு (Tripartite committee) அமைக்கவேண்டும். முன்பே அரசாங்கத்தின் ஒரு தீர்மானப்படி அவர்கள் ட்ராண்டிப்போர்ட், பிளாண்டேஷன் சிமென்ட், இவை யெல்லாவற்றிற்கும் கமிட்டி போடுவதாக இருந்தது. டெக்ஸ்டைல் இன்டஸ்ட்ரிக்கு அமைக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஆனால், அதற்கு அதிகாரம் கிடையாது. நல்ல அதிகாரத்துடன் தொழிலாளிகளும், முதலாளிகளும், அரசாங்கத்தாரும் உட்கார்ந்துகொண்டு உண்மையாகத் திட்டங்களை வகுத்து அதை அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவந்தாலும் அன்றாடம் ஏற்படும் தகராறுகளைப் பரிசீலனை செய்தும் உற்பத்தி பெருக்கத்திற்கு திட்டமிட்டுக்கொண்டும் தொழிலாளிகள் வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்தை உயர்த்தியும் செல்வனே காரியங்களை நடத்திவந்தால், தொழிலில் சமாதானம் ஏற்படும். முதலாளிகளும் அதற்குக் கட்டுப்பாடுவேண்டும். பொதுவாக எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் டால்மியா நிர்வாகத்திற்கு 29 லட்சம் லாபம் வந்தால் 33 லட்ச ரூபாய் தேய்மானத்திற்கென்று ஒதுக்கியிருக்கிறார்கள். தொழிலாளிகள் கேட்பது இரண்டு மாதச் சம்பளம், 33 லட்சம் ரூபாய் டிப்ரிசியேஷன் என்று ஒதுக்கிவிட்டு நியாயமாக இரண்டு மாதச் சம்பளத்தைப் போனசாகக் கேட்டால் அது மறுக்கப்படுகிறது. இம்மாதிரி தேய்மானம் போன்றவைகளை ஒதுக்க இன்சம் டாக்ஸ் சட்டம் அனுமதிக்கிறது. மனிதத் தன்மையாகப் பார்த்து உண்மையாக வேலை செய்கிறவர்களுக்கு ஏதாவது கொடுப்பதென்றால், அவர்களுக்கு மனது இடங்கொடுக்கவில்லை. 1948-49-ல் உண்மையாக நாட்டில் உற்பத்திப் பெருகவேண்டுமென்று சென்னை மாகாணத்தில் பேசப்பட்டபொழுது டால்மியா தொழிலாளர்கள் முதன்மையாக உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கியிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதை யாரும் மறுக்கமுடியாது. ஆகையால், தொழிலில் சமாதானம் வேண்டுமென்றால் நிச்சயமாக முக்கூட்டுக் கமிட்டி அமைத்து அதிகாரங்களை அதற்குக் கொடுத்து, மனிதன் நன்றாக வாழக்கூடிய அடிப்படை சம்பளம், போனஸ் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். அப்படிச் செய்தால் நிச்சயமாக சென்னை மாகாணத்திலே குறிப்பாக தமிழ்நாட்டிலே, தொழிலாளர்களிடையே சமாதானம் நிலவும், அதனால் உற்பத்தியும் பெருகும் என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு, இந்த வெட்டுப் பிரேரணையை ஆதரித்து என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.”

* SRI M. JAGANNATHAN :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, while supporting the cut motion, I would like to say a few words with regard to the problems of labour.

[Sri M. Jagannathan]

[26th July 1952]

“ Sir, labour can be divided into two broad categories—first of all, industrial labour and then agricultural labour. As regards industrial labour, I can say quite a number of things; but since the time at my disposal is very short, I do not want to catalogue the grievances of industrial labour. I would confine myself to inviting the attention of Members of this House to one particular industry wherein a large number of Harijans are employed, i.e., the tanning industry. In this industry, quite a large number of Harijans are employed. By the very nature of the work they are turning out in the tanneries, these people are put to very great inconvenience and a lot of suffering in the sense that they do not get even a subsistence wage and they are not working in sanitary surroundings. These Harijans are turning out work which is most unpleasant, as the work of tanning is most stinking and foul-smelling. Such tanning work is mostly undertaken by the Scheduled Castes. I submit these people should be given opportunities to earn a living wage which will enable them to make both ends meet and keep them in good comfort.

“ As regards agricultural labour, I would like to say that the vast majority of agricultural labourers happen to be landless labourers. Here again, most of them happen to be Harijans and they are still in a state of hereditary bondage; and they are working according to the sweet will and pleasure of the mirasdars and the landed gentry. The mirasdars do not even give a subsistence wage to these Harijans, even though they turn out an enormous amount of work in the fields from morning to evening, under rain and shine. Yet, what they get is only a pittance which is not sufficient to keep themselves and their families above want and to enable them to enjoy the fruits of life. I, therefore, request the Government to enact such legislation as would safeguard the interests of millions of these agricultural landless labourers in our State, who are mostly Harijans. I also request the Government to expedite the passing of an Agricultural Minimum Wages Act, so that these poor unfortunate millions of people may be benefited.

“ Another important aspect of the problem of labour, which I wish to refer to, is the practice obtaining in the South Arcot district, in one particular sugar factory at Nellikuppam. In that factory, not less than 3,000 to 4,000 people are employed, and most of them happen to be Harijans, members of the backward classes and poor Muslims. These people do not get a subsistence wage at all, and all that they get per day is less than a rupee in spite of the very valuable work that they turn out in the preparation of jaggery, sugar, sweetmeats, etc. The conditions of work inside the Nellikuppam factory are very very unsatisfactory and most nauseating—if I may be permitted to use that expression. I would invite the Hon. the Minister for Labour to pay a surprise visit, if possible, to this Nellikuppam sugar factory, so that he may be in a position to see for himself the appalling conditions in which these unfortunate Harijans and members of the backward classes and poor Muslims are working . . . ”

DEPUTY SPEAKER:—“ The House will now rise for lunch.”

26th July 1952]

(After lunch—2-30 p.m.)

* SRI M. VEERABHADRAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the cut motion and in doing so, I shall bring certain issues before the House. First of all, the Government must realise that labour is an important factor in production and as long as this factor is not recognized, the Government cannot bring about industrial peace in the land.

“ Coming to the Trade Unions Act, under that Act, the right is given to the workers to organize trade unions. But what is it that is happening in practice? Unions, sponsored by the employers are getting priority over genuine unions, regarding registration and other matters. Taking a matter of recent occurrence, certain workers of the Vuyyuru Sugar Mills applied for registration and before it was registered, the union sponsored by the management was registered—it was registered earlier than the genuine union. There is another aspect of the matter here. It is a long process to get a union registered. What is the process? First of all seven workers have to apply to the Registrar of Trade Unions; the Registrar in his turn sends the application to the Labour Officer concerned for enquiry and the Labour Officer at his convenience fixes a date and goes to the particular place or asks the workers to go to his office; then he verifies facts and sends the report to the Registrar and then there is the registration of the trade union. By the time this process is gone through it will be not less than two months. But, meanwhile, the employers will get a scent of it and they will use all the methods that they are capable of using, and by harassing and intimidating they get their union registered earlier. I want to suggest to the Government a method by which the registration can be expedited and that is this, Sir. The application must be submitted to the Registrar of Trade Unions and a copy should be sent to the Labour Officer concerned. The Labour Officer need not wait for a communication or instructions from the Registrar; on his own initiative he can make the necessary enquiries and satisfy himself whether the members are really workers of the undertaking and whether they have actually signed the applications and immediately the enquiry is over, he can send his report to the Registrar and see that the union is registered at an early date. If seven workers of the undertakings go to the Office of the Labour Officer and there sign in the presence of the Labour Officer, there need not be any enquiry and the Union can get itself registered almost immediately. In this connexion, I would like to suggest to the Government to fix a time-limit, say, a month within which the union should be registered. In the alternative, the Office of the Commissioner of Labour must intimate to the person concerned why there was delay in the matter of the registration.

“ Coming to trade disputes, much delay is being caused in settling them because of the long process and the length of time taken up before the trade dispute is referred for adjudication. For example, the workers of the Chittivalasa Jute Mills put up their

[Sri M. Veerabhadram] [26th July 1952]

demand before the management and the Labour Officer enquired into it but the report has not yet reached the Labour Commissioner though a period of two months has elapsed. And, in the meanwhile, if the workers go on strike, the Government will not hesitate to ban the strike and declare it as illegal but the workers' grievances will not be taken into consideration by the Government and the dispute referred for arbitration. I want in this connexion to draw the attention of the Government to a section of the Industrial Disputes Act. Under that provision, the Government need not necessarily follow this process because if there is an apprehension of a dispute arising in any industry, the Government can straightway refer the disputes to the Industrial Tribunal. I suggest that the Vuyyuru Sugar Mills dispute, the Chittivalasa Jute Mills dispute and the Nellore Motor Workers' dispute should all be referred to the Industrial Tribunal immediately so that no time may be lost.

"I wish to submit to the House that the Minimum Wages Act is a big hoax. In the morning today, during question-time, the Hon. the Minister for Labour, while replying to a supplementary question, said that the report of the Minimum Wages Committee had been published. But I want to submit that it is not correct and the report has not yet been published and it has not yet seen the light of day. What did the Committee recommend? The Committee recommend certain minimum wages for certain categories of employees under local authorities but the Government have put the report in the waste paper basket and of their own accord, they have fixed Rs. 25 as minimum wages and all this, after they had appointed a Committee to recommend minimum wages. The Government spent nearly Rs. 8,000 on the Committee and the Committee gave a report and are the Government justified in not publishing the report and not also implementing the recommendations? I say, therefore, that the Minimum Wages Act is a hoax; it is not being implemented properly and I, therefore, suggest that the G.O. No. 1355, dated the 25th March 1952, should be scrapped immediately and the whole thing must be re-examined or the recommendations of the Minimum Wages Committee must be implemented.

"Coming to the question of casual labour, I wish to submit that it is the most exploited and the most affected in the State. There is no law protecting the rights and interests of casual labour. I, therefore, urge upon the Government to bring in legislation immediately in the next sitting of the House with a view to regulate the conditions of casual labour.

"Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the period from 1948-51, there were 368 workers detained by the Government for reasons best known to the Government themselves. Most of them or almost all of them have not been taken back as soon as they were released and I want to urge upon the Government to see that they are taken back in employment immediately."

2-40 p.m. * SRI S. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, we know that the Labour Department is a machinery set up for

26th July 1952] [Sri S. Pakkiriswami Pillai]

implementing the policy of the Government as far as workers are concerned. When it is there specifically for safeguarding the interests of the workers, we have got instances to prove that this department has been working for promoting the interest of the capitalists and the employers. We know, Sir, in the last year, 1951, when there was a disturbance in the Buckingham and Carnatic Mills, the Development Department did not hesitate to sanction a Police station to be located inside the mills. Even though this question has now become a dead issue, the management of the Buckingham and Carnatic Mills have taken advantage of it for increasing the work-load and have made the workers work like slaves in the mills. In the 'Swadesamitran,' the 'Dinamani' and 'Express' workers' disputes, it was the same case. The Government was in a mood to help Mr. Goenka and Mr. Srinivasan who are the proprietors of those concerns. Even though the dispute has been referred to the Industrial Tribunal in Madras and afterwards the workers have taken the case before the Appellate Tribunal, it has not yet disposed of the case. The Appellate Court has not come over here to Madras. In this particular case, I may be permitted to observe that I am reliably informed that the Government of India have been asking the State Government to provide them with accommodation for locating a permanent Full Bench of the Appellate Tribunal. The Government, I am sorry to say, have not so far cared to see that a building is provided for the Bench.

"With regard to the question of minimum wages, I do not agree with the policy of the Government in fixing lower wages for several categories of employees. I know that in the Corporation for several categories of workers minimum wages have been fixed at Rs. 15 per mensem inclusive of all allowances. I am not able to see the real motive behind it. I do not know how the Government can have the moral courage to force other employers to fix higher rates of wages when they themselves are not coming forward to help these workers with better rates of wages. There is also this other question. We know that the Government of Madras are the first and foremost in enacting the Act called the Madras Shops and Establishments Act. It was enacted, as the Government claimed in the Preamble, with a view to controlling the working conditions of workers in shops and commercial establishments and hotels. But a perusal of the Act will show that there is no provision as far as fixing of minimum wages, annual increments, etc., is concerned and I think that the whole Act should be scrapped and a fresh Committee should be set up for substituting another Act. I am citing this as an example. Under section 41 of the Act, if after an enquiry a decree is passed, there is no provision in the Act to realize the decree amount from the employer, if he fails to comply with the orders of the appellate authority. In this case, the appellate authority is the Commissioner of Labour. For recovering decree amounts, there should be provisions, on the lines of the provisions in the Factories Act for the purpose of recovering the amount as land revenue.

[Sri S. Pakkiriswami Pillai] [26th July 1952]

"Regarding beedi workers, may I suggest that the Government should devise means by which there should be control over the issue of licences? When there is a dispute and the factory-owners are asked to do certain things, the factory-owners are not inclined to observe the terms and conditions specified by the Labour Commissioner or the Tribunal. In the absence of compliance, they should be able to penalise those people and that could be done only by cancelling their licences. Then only shall we be able to help this category of workers. I suggest that the beedi workers should be treated on the same footing as handloom weavers. Much more than a million are employed in these factories and most of them belong to the Muslim community and they are very poor. They are not well-treated by the factory-owners and the Government are not in a position to help them by providing suitable enactment to govern their conditions of service."

2 50
p.m.

* SRI N. MAHALINGAM :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, in rising to support this Demand—Labour including Factories—I have to make a few suggestions to the Hon. Minister for Industries. This Demand for Rs. 18 lakhs covers only a limited number of workers in this State. The workers who come under the Factories Act and the Shop Assistants Act and other Acts are only a small percentage as compared with the total number of workers in this State. Therefore, it is the duty of the Government to see that the whole working class is brought under one Act at an early date."

"Now I come to Factories. This is a subject in the Concurrent List in the Constitution and any measures connected with the factories have to be decided upon by the State Government in consultation with the Central Government. Sir, it would be better if the Centre contents itself with the broad principles of a particular measure and leaves it to the State Government to work out the details. Now, as it is, even for minor changes we have to consult the Central Government and this creates a lot of delay."

"Again, under the Industrial Disputes Act, there are a number of appeals that are being taken to Bombay. This system not only causes waste of time but also waste of money and waste of energy, both for the employers and employees. It would be better if the Tribunal constituted by the State Government is made the final Appellate Tribunal or in the alternative the High Court made the Appellate Court so far as industrial disputes are concerned. This will not only lessen the number of disputes but will be of some benefit to labour."

"In my constituency, there are about 40,000 plantation workers. Here also the State Government has to depend much upon the Central Government for bringing in any legislation for the welfare of the plantation workers. With regard to bonus for plantation workers, the Central Government has to decide about the quantum of bonus and the State Government has no voice in the matter. It would be better if more power in this regard is given to the State Government as that will improve the condition

26th July 1952] [Sri N. Mahalingam]

of the plantation workers. The conditions of workers in the plantations are much worse as compared with the workers in other industries like Textiles, Motor Transport, etc. The housing conditions of the plantation workers in the Tea Plantations at Anamalais are very bad. It will be better if new colonies are created in those areas. Now, the workers are living in the quarters provided by the management. It will be better if the managements and the Government give the money necessary for the creation of these colonies near the plantations. Even in the case of eviction, the workers who have been evicted need not leave their houses and go away.

" Sir, the workers employed in the Cinchona plantations run by the Government are not paid the same wages as are paid to the workers in the plantations under private management. The Government, as the biggest employer, should set an example for other employers by raising the wages of workers employed in their plantations. Similarly in the case of the Government Motor Transport, when the Venkatramana Award was announced, the Government said that they would be exempted from the award. Is it right on the part of the Government to get themselves exempted from the award when other employers are required to implement the award? The Government should be the first employer to implement the award.

" Now I come to the Health Insurance Scheme. This scheme has been instituted by the Central Government and they are going to administer it. It will create a lot of administrative difficulties if the Centre takes up the execution of this scheme. It will be better if the Department of Industries of the State Government is entrusted with this work.

" Sir, the Shop Assistants Act is being enforced even in minor panchayats, which creates a lot of difficulties. If the enforcement of this Act in minor panchayats and municipalities is left to the Chairmen of Municipalities, it will be better as the local people with their local influence will be able to implement the Act in a better way.

" In the big cities, Labour Officers can be directly appointed by the Commissioner of Labour. Even Assistant Labour Inspectors do not have a chance of getting promotion. They serve under the Factory Inspectors but are technically not qualified to be promoted to the superior's post. I hope the Government will look into the matter and see what can be done for them.

" After the Shop Assistants Act has come into force, a number of amendments have been brought forward which exempted certain establishments from the provisions of the Act. Now, there are more exemptions from the Act than the original Act itself. It will be better if a Committee is appointed to re-examine the provisions of the Act so that we can leave off some of the difficult clauses and see that the Act that is finally got up is properly enforced.

[Sri N. Mahalingam] [26th July 1952]

"Yesterday, my hon. Friend Mr. Venkateswarlu referred to the working of democracy in East European countries. The working of democracy in those countries is not proper. In those countries, even trade union rights are denied; there is no right of organising a Labour Union; and there is no right for the people to strike."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—"On a point of order, Sir, I want to know whether it is in order for the hon. Member to speak about East European countries, when they have nothing to do with the Demand under discussion?"

MR. SPEAKER :—"He is comparing the working of democracy in East European countries with our working of democracy."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—"Even that comparison, I submit, is not relevant here."

MR. SPEAKER :—"He considers it relevant."

* SRI N. MAHALINGAM :—"The hon. Member Mr. Gopalan accused the State Government as being a pro-capitalist Government. That is why I want to compare the democracies existing in East European countries with our democracy in this country. In those countries, even trade unions are not recognized. Even a slight negligence in industry on the part of a worker will entail a long prison sentence. In the case of damage caused to property due to wilful neglect, even death sentences are given. In our country such things are not done. Some time ago, in a factory at Madukkarai there was a fire accident. This was due to indiscipline in the labour movement which had been created by the irresponsible labour leaders who exist to-day. If there is discipline in the labour movement, it will not only help the working class but it will also be good for the nation. The employers who care for the future of the country should meet the requirements of labour and provide them with the necessary amenities. At the same time strict discipline should be enforced in the ranks of labour. New trade unions are in existence to-day and they have all been started to serve the political ends of certain politicians. In Coimbatore, a very powerful trade union of textile workers was in existence till recently. Now there are two or three trade unions under the name of three parties, with the result the textile workers of Coimbatore are now divided and their organisational strength has gone down."

"I now come to production. The Government should give first priority to production and that should be their primary consideration . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The hon. Member's time is up."

3 p.m. * SRI M. MUNI REDDI :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, much has been said with regard to industrial labour. We are glad that Government are taking a very keen interest in bettering the lot of labourers. Many legislative enactments have been passed in the

26th July 1952]

[Sri M. Muni Reddi]

past to provide for them insurance, provident fund, limited working hours, allowances, amenities, compensation and so on. What is most needed to-day is that those legislative enactments should be enforced to the satisfaction of the labourers. Then only the lot of the labourers will be improved and then only will Government win the confidence of the labourers.

" Sir, in this connexion, as far as agricultural labour is concerned, I beg to state that it is the most neglected. Out of sixty million people in this State industrial labour constitutes at the most ten per cent of them. Of the five crores of the rural population, more than 30 per cent constitutes agricultural labour. Now, to-day, what is the condition of the people in the villages? What are the facilities that Government have given to agricultural labour? Sir, we are very glad that Government propose to fix minimum wages for agricultural labour. In this connexion I want to say that they should fix also minimum price for agricultural produce. For, it is a well-known fact that to-day agriculture is not a paying industry. Even after fixing their wages, the peasantry would not be well off without fixing a minimum price for their produce. In this State, last year, the price of paddy per maund was Rs. 9; but we were importing more than seven to eight lakhs of tons of paddy from Burma and other places at the rate of Rs. 23 per maund. On account of this, our State had to lose 41 crores to foreign countries. Now if a higher price had been paid for our agricultural produce, there would have been more production of food in our country itself, and all this 41 crores could have been saved to our ryots.

" Then, Sir, in the rural areas, the condition of agricultural labour is bad. The peasant has to toil day in and day out. But what is the case of the industrial labour? His hours of work are fixed. Even though the agricultural labourer works day in and day out, he is not taken care of by the Government. Sir, in the City of Madras, in Gandhinagar lakhs of rupees have been spent on building houses; but, I ask, what amount has been spent in the rural areas for housing agricultural labour? Then, Sir, there is also unemployment in villages. For more than three to four months in the year, the agricultural labourer is unemployed. It is up to the Government to see that some employment is created for him in the off-season. Various measures on a co-operative basis like bee-keeping industry, poultry industry, etc., must be developed so that the income of the poor labourer may be increased. Then, Sir, other ameliorative measures should be passed so that the labourer in the rural areas may lead a decent life. In short, there is a lot to be done to improve the condition of the peasantry in the villages. If the labourer goes to the forest to cut trees, he goes at night, and what protection is there for him against the wild animals? And what compensation is there if he loses his life? But, for industrial labour, there is compensation for loss of life. At present the rural masses are simply exploited like anything for the good of the urban people. While much is said about industrial labour, very little is said about agricultural labour. To-day, we talk of food production; we talk of

[Sri M. Muni Reddi] [26th July 1952]

increased production; we talk of self-sufficiency in food and so on; and how can we expect the peasantry to work day in and day out unless his condition is improved? Unless that is done it will be very difficult for this country to solve the food crisis.

"Then, Sir, there was a suggestion with regard to the municipal employees union. It was said that outsiders were not allowed to be members of the union. That is, only municipal employees can be members of the union; and only they can occupy any position in the union. This rule debarb outsiders, that is, non-employees from becoming Secretary or President or any other functionary. I request Government to look into this matter and make suitable provisions in the rules to enable outsiders to enter the union. For the employees by themselves are not able to put forth their grievances properly to the proper authorities. With these words, Sir, I support the Demand."

* SRI G. C. KONDAIAH :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose the Demand and support the cut motion. Sir, there are labour conciliation officers and labour tribunals to deal with the problem of labour, and yet, there is discontent and strike in every sphere of industry. Now, what is the cause for this unrest? Government may feel that certain people are always inciting workers to unrest and anarchy. That is entirely baseless. Can hundreds and lakhs of workers afford to go on strike and lose their job for fun? Surely there must be some reason for their action. Unless there is something seriously wrong, a strike would not take place. Now, what is the cause for all these labour strikes? If we look into the life of the labourers and analyse their grievances it would reduce itself ultimately to the question of ensuring a living wage. So that is the first cause. Next comes the need to have a guarantee for their job. In both these matters Government are not doing anything. Only by solving these two problems satisfactorily can justice be done to the working class. So, Sir, unless and until Government fix a minimum living wage for all categories of workers including agricultural workers and see that it is paid by all employers, be they the owners of factories or merchants or landlords, there will be no peace in the country. Government should not keep silent listening to the grievances of workers when they approach them. They should not allow the employers to have their own way. Government, in fact, all along by their silence, were encouraging employers to exploit the workers more and more. I shall give the House an instance of this, and from it, it will be seen how Government have been shirking their responsibility. Sir, in 1948 in the case of bus workers in Nellore, the bus workers demanded from the Naziriah United Bus Service, Nellore, bonus and dress allowance. But the management refused it on the ground that the demands were high. Thereupon the bus workers decided on a strike. At this stage the Government intervened and the bus strike was averted. The case was referred to a labour tribunal and it gave an award. But the award was not implemented by the management. For four years the bus workers waited, looking to the officials to intervene and force the management to implement the award. The workers requested the Government to intervene

26th July 1952] [Sri G. C. Kondaiah]

and force the management to implement the award. But Government kept quiet and did not move an inch in the matter. So, again, in the second week of May last, there was a bus strike in Nellore. This time the Government did not interfere. But the District Collector and the Labour Conciliation Officer intervened and somehow the strike was stopped after four days and a compromise was effected.

“ Sir, the Labour Conciliation Officer at Guntur tried to see that the agreement was implemented but every effort of his was in vain. They again approached the concerned Minister and the officials and so far nothing has been done. Thus, it is the owners and the owners only who flout the awards of the labour tribunals. In the recent strike also it was the owners who flouted the award of the tribunal. It is they who are against the Government and the Government have no power or strength to go against them. Even with all their lathies and guns, they will never go against the owners. But, if it is a case against the workers the Government will immediately see that Law and Order is maintained and that the Police Force moves against the workers. If it is a case of the owners flouting their awards the Government will not go against them. 3-10 p.m.

“ This has been the case even with the tannery-owners in Vellore who closed their tanneries. Recently some tanneries were reopened but the owners had another trick up their sleeves to shut the workers out of their jobs. They have changed the old names of the tanneries and put up new boards announcing new names. Some of the workers have been done out of their jobs on the plea that the owners were starting new industries. This is how the tannery workers are being exploited and the Government have not at all intervened and, if at all they intervene, it takes them years and years to come to a settlement. We find that some cases are not referred to the labour tribunals at all. If this is the way in which Government are proceeding, I do not think there will be any peace or contentment among the workers. If the Government are interested in solving the problems of the workers, they must take strong measures and stern action against the owners to see that they at least implement the awards of the labour tribunals. Wherever there are strikes, the disputes must be immediately referred to the labour tribunals and the awards of the tribunals must be implemented at once. If the Government do not adopt this attitude, I am sure the workers are not going to keep quiet for a long time. Already there is discontent and there are strikes everywhere in every branch of industry. If the Government do not change this attitude of theirs, the discontent will be intensified and then peace, Law and Order and everything else will be in danger. I, therefore, request the Government to see that they do not side with owners. They should put an end to this partiality and side with the cause that is just and see that the lot of the workers is really improved.”

* SRI C. H. KANARAN :—“ Mr Speaker, Sir, தொழிலாளிகளது அமைதியைப் பாதுகாக்க அரசாங்கம் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.”

26th July 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, this morning the Hon. Minister for Labour introduced the Demand under the head ‘ Labour including Factories ’ and made a report on that to the House. Hearing the introductory speech of the Hon. Minister, I was wondering whether he was reading through a report prepared for an encyclopædia regarding the number of labour laws that have been enacted by the Government of India and what exactly the scope of these labour laws was. The entire report just gives us a resume of the various laws enacted during the last four or five years, the Industrial Disputes Act, the Minimum Wages Act, the Social Insurance Scheme, the Provident Fund Scheme, etc., etc. But, what the Minister for Labour failed to tell us, or forgot to tell us or did not want to tell us or he cannot tell us to-day—I am aware of the fact that he has been in charge of the department only during the last three or four months but nonetheless it is his duty—is how exactly these various labour laws have been administered in this State. What is exactly expected of the Minister for Labour and of the Government is, whether as a result of the working of these various Acts, it is considered necessary to bring some changes or formulate a new policy. We are not here to be just taught what exactly is the scope of the various laws that have been enacted from time to time. We, on this side of the House, are quite aware of the fact that many of these Acts are mere paper Acts.

“ One thing I would like to clear at the very outset. It is often said that those people who call themselves as labour leaders, who style themselves as labour leaders, are interested in creating trouble. It is further said that the labourers are innocent people, that they are all susceptible to alien influences and that the labour leaders are a set of politicians who have their own personal or political ends to gain; and so they go, it is said, to the innocent labourers just for the purpose of inciting them and all the trouble in this country is caused by these diabolical set of people. 3-20
p m.

“ Mr. Rajagopalachari was the Prime Minister of this State from 1937 to 1939. Subsequently there have been various other Governments including that of the Congress. When Mr. Rajagopalachari was the Prime Minister of this State, there were a number of labour disputes. I would just ask him to refer back to the adjudication proceedings or proceedings of the Courts of Enquiry conducted during the period between 1937 and 1939. I throw a challenge to the Chief Minister whether he can point out a single instance wherein the Labour Courts which went into the various disputes that had been raised by us had found us to be in the wrong. I make bold to say, even after 1937-39, between 1942 and 1948, let him refer to the various adjudication proceedings in which we were parties—let him for example refer to the Madukkarai adjudication proceedings—and point out a single instance wherein our case was found to be wrong and wherein it was stated that we on this side incited labour.

“ I would like next to refer to the basic policy underlying the whole thing. It was certainly very good of the Hon. Labour

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[26th July 1952]

Minister to give us once again a resume of these various legislations. But we know how these legislations have been worked. Whatever might have been the pieces of legislation that were enacted, all these legislations are dead letters, so long as we do not have a strong labour organisation, a strong trade union organisation, which can stand guard over the interests of the workers and which will be able to take up cases where these labour laws are actually infringed. Without such strong trade unions, it will not be possible for the Government or for anybody to enforce these legislations whatever might be the nature of the laws that might be enacted from time to time. It must be the duty of the Government to see that trade unions in this country flourish. This is the basic thing. What is the attitude of the Government with regard to trade union organisations? Well, Sir, homilies are preached that there must be co-operation between labour and employers and that labour and employers are partners in the industry. I do not know what exactly is meant by the terms, 'co-operation' or 'partnership.' These two words connote certain things. These two words, as far as I understand the English language, connote that there is equality of status. Unless equality of status is accepted, where is the question of co-operation between labour and employers? What is the use of preaching from house-tops that labour and employers must co-operate? I ask, is there equality of status for these people to come together?"

"What is the fundamental thing that has been accepted in all civilized countries where the trade union movement has gone forward and where, for example, industrial development has taken place? The basic and fundamental thing that has been accepted in all those countries where industrialization has taken place—I am not talking of Nazi or Fascist countries—is the right of collective bargaining. This is the basic and fundamental thing governing industrial relations. Have we got that right of collective bargaining? Does our Constitution guarantee it? Our Constitution does not guarantee this right of collective bargaining to the workers. What is the attitude of our Government towards collective bargaining? The principle of collective bargaining presupposes that trade unions must be recognized by the employers. Unless there is a trade union which is recognized by the employer and which is fully competent to conclude a collective agreement on behalf of the entire labour, the term 'collective bargaining' loses all meaning. Therefore, the question of recognition of trade unions is not something in the nature of a gift. It is not something in the nature of a favour that is to be conferred on labour by the employers. Behind the principle of recognition of trade unions lies the understanding that there must be collective bargaining. Without the right of recognition there is no question of collective bargaining, and there is no question of co-operation. There is only conflict. This is the elementary principle of trade union organization. Do our Government enforce this right anywhere? I know that employers in this country to-day do not want to recognize trade unions because they feel that the trade union organizations cut across their very profits. Therefore, employers

26th July 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

are interested in starting what is called in common parlance, company unions. There is, for example, the T.V.S. Bus Service in Madurai. Hundreds of thousands of workers were dismissed simply because they had struck work in 1948. Immediately after the strike the company started a union. Of course, for all outward purposes it is a trade union. The Government also registered that union. Of course, under the Trade Unions Registration Act, any seven workers can form a trade union organization. Such a thing is not peculiar to the T.V.S. Bus Service Company alone. This is something common to all the managements in the State and in the country. Of course, our Government will be ready to recognize all unions formed by the managements, which in any other country will be deemed as arising out of malpractice or out of unfair practice as it is called in trade union language. Such unions will be recognized by our Governments and the Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari as Chief Minister will even go and preside over the functions of such unions. Taking advantage of the Chief Minister's visit, the management may even dismiss some workers whom they do not want.

"What is the attitude that the Government have adopted on the question of victimisation of workers? In the past, Government have stated that there should be no victimisation. As a matter of fact, when the Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari was the Chief Minister in this State, during 1937-39, there was a dispute between the workers and employers of the Tramway Company, Madras, and the dispute was referred for adjudication by Justice Panduranga Rao. In the award given by Justice Panduranga Rao, which is one of the finest awards given so far, it is laid down as a basic principle that there should be no victimization of trade union workers. Subsequently that principle was followed for a number of years. But what is happening now? Hundreds and thousands of workers are being dismissed on the flimsiest of grounds. For example, is it not a fact, Sir, in 1948 in the Madura Mills, about 168 workers were dismissed for the only reason that they were active trade union workers? A similar thing happened in Vikramasingapuram and the management shamelessly stated before the Tribunal that certain workers were discharged because they had something to do with the Communist Party, or simply because they were having the Communist Party emblem of the sickle and hammer on their Savings Bank Pass Books. This sort of thing has been going on in this State during the last three or four years.

"This is a thing which is confined not only to this place. There was a fire in some department of the Madurai Cement Factory in 1949. Immediately about 38 workers were dismissed. I know one of the biggest Congress leaders of the State, Mr. C. P. Subbiah, went about saying that it was a case of sabotage where the workers deliberately set fire and on that basis canvassed votes against the Communist Party. But what happened? The police found that there was no case against the workers whatsoever; the case had to be withdrawn. The Factory was insured and the management approached the Insurance

3-30
P.M.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[26th July 1952]

Company. The enquiry made by the Company revealed that it was not a case of sabotage but that the fire was caused by the falling down of a live electric wire. Of course, the management got the money allright from the Insurance Company. When it was said that the discharge of workers was victimization, what was it that the management told us? In a recent letter written by the Conciliation Officer to the Secretary, Development Department, a copy of which has been received by us, it is said: 'The management tells us that these people were dismissed not for any fault of theirs. The police reported that they were engaged in subversive activities and, therefore, they had no other go than to dismiss them in the interests of the workers as well as the management.' I do not know why the police were asked to make a report to the management. Anyway, there it is. The management dismissed people on the basis of certain reports. Is it not a case of victimization? I can quote hundreds of similar cases. Mr. Jeevanandam referred to the case of Thompson & Co. In a number of factories, victimization has become a most common thing. So long as the policy of not recognizing trade unions continues, there cannot be any co-operation or collective bargaining and all talk of co-operation has no meaning whatsoever.

"What is the attitude of the Government towards their own labour? When the Bus Award was given in 1949, the Madras Government said that the Government City Bus Service was exempted from the operation of the award and that the award was applicable only to the other bus operators. When the question of confirmation of people who have put in five years and ten years of service arises, what is the attitude of the Government? For example, is it not a fact that in the Madras Electricity System, people who have put in ten years and fifteen years of service are on what is called non-muster roll? When that is the attitude the Government take, I fail to understand how they can ask other people to behave properly. I can go on multiplying instances. In department after department, workers remain temporarily for years together. It is not as if the work on which they are employed is intermittent; it is a continuous work. Nonetheless, workers have been kept on either casual labour or non-muster roll labour and things of that type. They are not eligible for the benefits for which other workers are eligible.

"It is very good to read in the papers that there is a minimum wage legislation. But how are the Government implementing it? When they started to implement this legislation, a number of trade unions in the State which were previously fighting for the interests of the workers were declared illegal. The real representatives of the workers were not consulted. What is the result? Somebody said this morning that the minimum wage of municipal workers was fixed at Rs. 25. Throughout this State, except in the famine-affected areas, an agricultural worker gets a minimum wage of one rupee per day. I ask the Hon. Minister whether a municipal worker should be paid much less than an agricultural worker. I am not saying that the agricultural worker should be paid less. Certainly we are all interested in improving the condition of

26th July 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

agricultural workers. A municipal worker who is serving in the City has got to pay a high rent. If he is paid such a low wage including dearness and other allowances, what is the worth of this minimum wage legislation at all? I know, as a matter of fact, that in a number of places, the minimum wage has become the maximum wage. It is the minimum as well as the maximum. Take plantation labour, for example. The minimum wage recommended by the Labour Commissioner is Rs. 1-7-0. In the Anamalais in the adjacent area of Travancore-Cochin, the minimum wage has been fixed at Rs. 1-11-0. But our Minimum Wage Committee has fixed it at Rs. 1-0-6. A plantation labourer who is working only 2 miles away from our State border gets Rs. 1-11-0, whereas a labourer, simply because the plantation in which he works happens to be in this State, gets only Rs. 1-0-6.

"The Hon. Labour Minister was cataloguing the benefits derived from the various adjudication awards and said that the Industrial Tribunals had tried to relate wages to the level of profit obtaining in the industry. I am not an admirer of compulsory adjudication. I am one of those who feel that there should be no compulsory adjudication. It is one of the basic principles of trade unionism. That is just by the way. What are the steps that the Government have been taking all these years to see that the awards which are favourable to the workers are implemented? I can quote instance after instance where such awards have not been implemented. In 1948—there was no Industrial Tribunal at the time—the Government appointed what was called the Standardization Committee. It had no legal sanction whatsoever. The moment the Standardization Committee issued a report, copies of it were given to the employers even before they were given to the representatives of labour and trade unions. The Coimbatore mill employers jumped at that report and said within 15 days that 11,000 workers should be retrenched and the workload should be increased.

"It was not a binding award. There was no legal sanction behind it. But the Coimbatore mill-owners jumped at it and sent out about 11,000 workers. What was the Industrial Truce Resolution of the Government of India? Just about 15 or 20 days earlier I was a party to that resolution. I do not want to go into the details of that resolution. The basic fact is that that resolution postulated certain things and also that there shall not be anything done which would adversely affect the condition of the workers. It promised certain other things in favour of the working class. But nothing has been done. Immediately after the resolution was passed in Delhi, and the moment I came back, I was faced with the situation arising out of the dismissal of 11,000 workers. The Coimbatore mill-owners sent out 11,000 workers on 26th January 1948. This was the result of the Industrial Truce Resolution. Did the Government of Madras at least take into their heads to consider 'here is a resolution which all parties have accepted; the mills cannot dismiss workers like this; let us wait; let us deal with the question afresh with reference to

3-40
p.m.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[26th July 1952]

the Industrial Truce Resolution.'? They did not. When about 11,000 workers were dismissed on the basis of a report, which did not have any legal sanction behind it whatsoever, naturally they, the workers in Coimbatore, Salem and Tiruchi, who were affected by that award, immediately went on a general strike. It is not we alone that went on a general strike. The hon. Member, Mr. Kuppaswami, sitting opposite was also one of the leaders of that strike. The Socialist Union also was involved. I would ask the Government to look into the report published by the Government of Madras just a few months back—on the eve of elections. They said that the Communists alone were responsible for the strike forgetting clean that all the three unions went on strike against the unjust retrenchment of about 11,000 workers in an industry, which engaged 40,000 men. The Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari was not here at that time. Immediately a Police Force was sent there. That was one of the longest strikes in the history of the trade union movement. It was one of the most bitter strikes involving about 40,000 workers. Even the then Home Minister Dr. P. Subbarayan had to admit on the floor of the Assembly that that was one of the most peaceful strikes ever conducted. What did we meet with? Within about a month arrest warrants were issued against us and against a number of people who were leading the strike and we were clapped in jail. (Interruption by the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.) Arrest warrants were there against the Communists. Did we indulge in any violence at that time? Was there a single instance of any violence? Everybody had to admit that it was one of the most peaceful strikes. Nonetheless so many workers were arrested. That happened in 1948. When the workers went on strike against the implementation of a committee's report, which had no legal sanction behind it, and which the trade unions had not considered the Government were good enough to go to the employers and insist that the recommendations in the report must be implemented. That was the stand taken by the Government. Awards after awards gave something to the working class. For example, in Madukkarai in 1946 the Union Secretary was dismissed. The adjudicator found that the Secretary was dismissed as a measure of victimization, and so he must be reinstated with full back pay. We are now in 1952. Even to-day that comrade has not been reinstated. This has been brought to the notice of the Government hundreds of times. Still that award has not been implemented. Take the award in the case of Rajamani Bus Transport. It has been brought to the notice of the Government many times that this award has not been implemented. Take the case of the Raja Mills, Madurai. Though the person was jailed, he somehow escaped and went to Pondicherry. We had not been able to get at him. He is now in Tirumangalam; of course, it is a different matter. What steps did the Government take to see that these awards, which were favourable to the workers, were actually implemented? Is it a case of the Government having no powers whatsoever? It is not the case. As a matter of fact, even the Trade Disputes Act gives powers to recover the sums, due under the awards, from the

26th July 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

managements as though they were an arrear of land revenue. Why is it that the Government have not taken action against even a single employer? But the moment the workers go on strike, the Government declare that strike illegal, saying that during the pendency of the award—it may be that the award is not implemented—the workers dare not go on strike. The Government will put in jail the workers for three months or six months. This is a very common thing. The basic thing—the running thread—of all this is this, namely, what exactly is the attitude of the Government towards labour? I am not now asking that all our industries must be nationalized. Certainly I say that some industries must be taken over by the Government. We say that the industries which are to-day owned by the British in this country—they have no place whatever in this country now—should be taken over by the Government. We say that our industries should flourish, and our national industries will flourish. Towards that end, we are prepared to do something. Labour certainly cannot be a party to the suppression of its rights. It cannot co-operate then. All that we are asking for to-day is only that the Government should create those conditions wherein we will be able to develop the industries in our country. We must create those conditions which will assure industrial prosperity to us for a long time to come. The question of socialization comes only after a sufficient amount of industrialization in the country. Till then we shall not quarrel. So long as those conditions are not created, let us think of doing something for creating those conditions which will ensure co-operation between labour and employers.

“ Sir, I would like to know the attitude of the Government towards the biggest problem that is facing the entire country, namely, the unemployment problem of the working class. The unemployment problem is not confined to any one area. It is a problem that is facing the entire country. It involves the textile workers, the tannery workers, the daily wage-earners, etc. It affects industry after industry. Have the Government any idea regarding this unemployment problem at all? Have the social insurance measures been implemented? In what industry, have they been implemented? From February onwards, hundreds and thousands of workers did not get work even for three or four days in the week. They were getting hardly work for two days in the week on account of electricity shortage. Did the Government consider it very necessary to give the workers something so that they could live? When the Coimbatore mill workers asked the Government to give them loans of Rs. 100 each so that they could at least carry on for a month, what was the attitude of the Government? Is it that the Government could not find the money for all these workers? As a matter of fact, the Government did find the money to subsidize the Harvey Mills in Madurai to the tune of a crore of rupees in the year 1949 to enable them to purchase American cotton when they found the price of the American cotton to be very high.

“ But when it comes to a question of helping the working class, the Government do not have money. I say the whole policy and

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [26th July 1952]

the entire attitude of the Government must change. They must think of a new policy. They must ensure the right of recognition to trade unions so that there may be collective bargaining. Once the Government ensure collective bargaining, then the Labour Minister and the Labour Department will not have much of work and the labour, the working class and the employers will come together and settle their differences. Therefore, my request to the Government is that they should see to it that collective bargaining is ensured. Unless that is ensured, all talk of co-operation is going to be moonshine."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must express a feeling of satisfaction and a sort of gratitude for the very, very valuable suggestions which most of the hon. Members have given on this Demand. Member after Member did offer constructive criticisms. They wanted to know the policy of the Government in this matter. Many of them said, 'The Hon. Minister is new to the job and, therefore, perhaps some consideration has to be shown for any shortcomings that might have been attributed to the work of the Labour Department.' I thank them sincerely for their good words.

" But the hon. Gentleman Sri K. P. Gopalan who moved the cut motion, of course, was in quite a different position. I must confess I had a feeling of despair, after hearing his speech. He had no belief in the Labour Department, in the labour leaders, in the Labour Minister, in the Judges and in the Industrial Tribunals. I do not know in what he has belief. Has he belief in himself, or does he believe in the machinery that is said to be the ideal to solve all industrial disputes in the country? I am afraid he has taken a very uncharitable attitude towards not only the department but towards good Government. I am only sorry that I have to disapprove of and disagree with all that he has said."

(The hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan rose in his seat.)

" MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. Minister is not yielding."

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Unless it is a point of order, I am afraid I cannot yield."

(The hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan still did not resume his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. Minister is not yielding. The hon. Member can say what he wishes to say only if the Minister yields."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, I would like to say what the policy of the Government would be and should be. I am afraid the hon. Gentleman, Sri P. Ramamurthi has taken much of the wind out of my sails. I do not know by what television he understood what I had in my mind. But I shall say that I should always like it to be the policy of any good Government in any part of the world to see that labour and employer sit across the table and that too most amicably and in a friendly spirit and settle their differences. It was only the other day that I saw a film

26th July 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

'Union Local' which, I think the hon. Member, Sri Anthony Pillai, will bear with me when I say that, he also saw and which Sri Guruswami also saw, and in which we had an indication as to how labour differences were settled in some countries of the world. There was no labour leader, there was no Minister, and there was no Commissioner of Labour. But when a dispute arose, the workers themselves sent a representative for conciliation. It is a very good film which is available in Tamil and in Telugu in the United States Information Service office. There is not anything political in it. It is purely informative and in it we see how differences between employers and workers could be settled without Government help and without any outsider's help. When I was seeing that film, my friend Sri Guruswami said that the only happy man who saw the film was the Hon. Minister. I agree with him in that respect. Here were two parties sitting across the table and fighting over their differences, one asking for the balance sheet and the other showing it to the workers, the workers disbelieving it and, of course, the employer proving by means of the audited accounts that the balance sheet was correct; and then they agreed, item by item and finally came to the conclusion that they would take six out of ten and that they would be happy partners. That was the ideal shown in the film. It cannot, however, happen in this country. The hon. Gentleman, Sri Ramamurthi said that labour had very good men. I endorse it, but I do not agree with him in what he said afterwards. I said and I still maintain that our labour has very good men but it is influenced by three sets of people in this world. First of all, it is influenced by the labour leader who promises the labour too much. He paints a very rosy picture of the future. He puts a target which is very high for anybody to follow. (Interruption.) Well, Sir, the labour leader who sits in front of me may be very reasonable but the underlings in the districts are perhaps not as reasonable as he is. I hear daily reports and stories of strikes launched on flimsy grounds, of stay-in strikes, of assaults on individuals, of bus bodies being ripped open, and of articles being stolen. I receive this information daily from various sources. (An hon. Member: 'We don't believe in them.') You may say you don't believe in the sources. But I tell you the sources are there. The information I have given is what I get. Am I, therefore, wrong in assuming that my poor labour leader is painting too rosy a picture for labour? In addition to that, the hon. Member, Sri Palaniandi was saying this morning that not only the labour leaders but also political parties were at them and the Socialists, the I.N.T.U.C., the Communists and various other groups were at them. I do not know what the poor labourer can do with so many people surrounding him. Labour is not given an opportunity even for a moment to think calmly as to what its real interests are. How then could there be collective bargaining, of employer and employee sitting across the table and settling disputes? Labour is not given even a chance to think which sort of collective bargaining is good for it? I, therefore, feel that labour leaders are one set of people who influence the labourers.

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [26th July 1952]

" Second comes, of course, the capitalist. Now the capitalist is presumed to make huge profits. No doubt they were making huge profits in former days. Sir, I am now in the peculiar position, thanks to the Hon. the Chief Minister, of being both the Minister for Labour and the Minister for Industry. Therefore, I have more opportunities than the labour leaders themselves of meeting capitalists, hearing their stories, and looking into their accounts. I am now more than ever convinced that the profits are not as huge as they were before. On the other hand, their expenses are more, the cost of raw materials is higher, and the taxes are more. Therefore, their profits are not much. They show their accounts to me. (Interruption.) They are afraid of showing their accounts to the labour leaders. But they trust me and show them to me and I am convinced that their profits are not very much now. There is also one other reason for their refusing to show their accounts to the labour leaders. They fear that if they yield at a particular level and say that this shall be the beginning and the end of all disputes, the labour leaders will make that a basis for further agitation and will land them more and more in trouble. Sir, the balance sheets are there. There are good and bad employers. It is a very good suggestion made by my hon. Friend Sri Kuppuswami and supported by the hon. Member Sri Sridharan that balance sheets should be made available to labour. I entirely agree that it is a suggestion which all good employers should take into consideration. But as often happens, nobody believes in that balance sheet. The hon. Gentleman Sri Nagi Reddi said that he did not believe it. (Interruption.) I am not prepared to enter into a discussion with the hon. Gentleman. He does not believe the balance sheets. Therefore, why should he bother about them? In view of the facts I have stated already, I feel that the second set of people are also putting the labourers into trouble.

" Third comes the Government. The poor labourer thinks that the Government can help him out of all the difficulties in the world. But how does he expect the Government to help him out of all the difficulties? The hon. Member, Sri Kanaran was speaking as though I was an autocrat. He said that, whenever a request was made for the facility of a house or for the payment of minimum wages, I should not say that I would consider but I should say 'Yes', as if I had it in my power to say so. I wish Sri Kanaran gives me those powers. But I am afraid he would not give me those powers. If he gives me those powers, surely I would come to his help. I have to work within the framework of the Constitution. Within that framework there are certain laws. There are the laws of conciliation, adjudication, and appeal to the Tribunals. Let us first take up conciliation. It is not always that the workers want conciliation. The hon. Member was right when he said that he did not want conciliation and that the cases should be sent up to the Tribunals. Of course, we have got a number of people saying that under section 10 (2) of the Act, the Government have a right to send every case for adjudication. May I respectfully differ from both the hon. Members, Sri Anthony

26th July 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

Pillai and the hon. Member who spoke from another side of the House to the effect, that the Government had the right to send every case for adjudication? I say the Government have not got such a right. Under section 10 (2) of the Act, only if both the parties are agreed that there should be adjudication, the Government have the right to send the case for adjudication. Otherwise, I have to go through the process of conciliation. (At this stage, the hon. Member Sri Anthony Pillai rose in his seat but the Hon. Minister did not yield.) This morning the hon. Member spoke about the disputes relating to the Spencer & Co., the 'Swadesamitran' and the 'Indian Express.'

"I believe that Mr. Anthony Pillai raised the question under section 10 (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act and wanted the Government to take action under that Section. I told him that only when the employers and the workers are agreeable, we can act under that Section, but he did not listen to my advice. The matter was taken to the High Court and the High Court said that the Government cannot take action under section 10 (2). That is why the case of the Indian Express Group and Spencer & Co. failed. Unless both parties are agreeable, the only course open to the Government is to follow section 10 (1) and that is what we are doing. I agree that conciliation is a thankless job. I thought that the only department in which there is no question of money and the only department in which the police are not wanted is the Labour department. But, some hon. Members complained that there was money for the Inspectors of Labour and that there was corruption and that police was used to put down labour. I take this opportunity to repudiate such statements. I am surprised at such remarks. If we send police to any place, let me tell my Friends here, it is not for the purpose of strengthening the hands of the capitalists, it is not for the purpose of helping the employers and it is not for the purpose of intimidating labour, but it is for the purpose of ensuring safety, it is for the purpose of maintaining law and order, it is for the purpose of ensuring the smooth working in the place of work. Some of the hon. Members referred to the stationing of police in the Buckingham and Carnatic Mills and other Mills. The Hon. Chief Minister has already made the position clear on the floor of the House that Police was not brought in for helping the capitalists and putting down the labour movement, but was brought in with the intention of protecting property, ensuring safety of lives and maintaining order. In all the cases mentioned by the Members, I can tell them that the moment safety of property and law and order were ensured, the police was withdrawn.

"I shall now pass on to some of the stray criticisms mentioned by some of the hon. Members. The hon. Member, Sri K. P. Gopalan complained that the workers were not given freedom to organise themselves into unions and associations. May I protest most emphatically against such wrong statements? We have been permitting the workers to have as many unions, as many associations and as many organizations as they want. We do

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

[26th July 1952]

not object to their having any number of unions. But I may tell my Friends that recognition of such unions is not our job and it is left to the management to recognise such of the unions and associations as they like. According to the present law, it is not part of our job to recognise these unions. Probably, in the legislation that the Central Government are contemplating to bring in, there may be a provision for recognising major unions and organizations. When this provision comes into force, it may be possible for us to recognise an organization formed by the workers. But till then, it is not fair to accuse Government and say that we have not given freedom to workers for organizing Unions. Some hon. Members complained about the enormous delay in the registration of these Unions. Well, that is a matter for consideration and I shall see how registrations can be expedited.

“ Some hon. Members, while referring to the working of the Tribunals made certain serious allegations. They complained about enormous delay in giving awards, about the personnel and about so many other things. I think everybody will agree that it is the primary duty of the Government to appoint a Judge. Having appointed him, will it be fair on our part to tell him, ‘ Well, look here. You must give judgment in this case within such and such a time and in such and such a manner.’? The request of some of the hon. Members comes to that. If we were to accede to such a request made by some hon. Members on the other side, the very purpose for which these Tribunals are constituted will be vitiated. Therefore, I do not agree with the suggestions made by the hon. Member Sri Gopalan in this regard. I cannot ask these Judges who are appointed to these Tribunals to hurry up their judgment in the various cases referred to them. What we can do is this and this only. Once in three months we review the progress and speed with which they decide the cases. On such reviewing, if we are convinced that there was delay, we will tell those Judges, ‘ Well, gentlemen, this is not fair, you are not proceeding with speed. Can’t you please do something to hurry up ’? The Government can go only thus far and no further. It is not fair on our part to meddle with the work of the Judges and tell them what they should do and how they should give the award and all that. It is rather unfortunate that some hon. Members doubted the capacity of the Tribunals. I repudiate such remarks. All of them are seasoned Judges and all of them are men who have spent their lifetime in the Legal Department. If you think that a Judge cannot satisfactorily settle these disputes between the employers and labour, who else in this world can do it?

“ Some hon. Members referred to the need for having industrial courts. At the present moment, I agree that there is no provision for having an Industrial Court. I understand that in the contemplated Labour Relations Bill which the Central Government are going to bring in, there will be provision for constituting an Industrial Court. When such Courts are established the labourers will have the right and privilege to go to those courts.

26th July 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

“ Certain complaints were made that, when these Tribunals gave their award, the Government did not enforce those awards on the employers, that the employers were only fined and let off and that as a result of this the workers were helpless. Mr. Ramamurthi also referred to this and he was right when he said that the Government had power to collect the arrears from the employers as if they were arrears of land revenue. So, people are prosecuted for non-implementation of the awards. This power was not there in the old Act. We took powers for prosecuting them and getting the arrears from them under the new amendment.

“ Some hon. Members complained about the Works Committee. I have no hesitation in saying that we will do what all we can in this matter. But the thing is most of the labour leaders are quite against the formation of such Committees. The stronger these Committees are, the less influence the labour leaders will have.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ We are for it.”

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The hon. Member may be for it. But some of the labour leaders of his side made very disparaging remarks about these committees and they did not want such committees. (Interruption.) My friend says that those remarks were directed against the existing committees. May I tell those hon. Members that the members of the existing committees are elected by the workers themselves and not nominated by the Government or anybody else? If the workers have not elected proper men for these committees, then it is not the fault of the Government. They must blame themselves and cannot blame others.

“ The hon. Gentleman Mr. Anthony Pillai said that the Government were leaving sharks and catching only small fish. This Government are not doing any such thing and his remark is quite unfair. Reference was made to the Ambi's Cafe incident. I must tell this House all the facts about this matter. There is a difference of Rs. 8 between what the adjudicator has recommended and what the management is prepared to offer. The management says that as the workers were given boarding and lodging the establishment should not be asked to pay the full Rs. 26. The labourers were asked whether they would like to have cash or would like to have boarding and lodging. There is difference of opinion among them. I understand that the labour leaders have advised them to ask for cash. That is my information and it is subject to correction. Even among the labour leaders, there seems to be no unanimity of opinion. So that is the position. Now, the hon. Member, Sri Pakkiriswamy Pillai, has raised this point again through his organization and I am trying to see if conciliation could be attempted again. I still believe in conciliation and I hope a time will come in this country when conciliation will be considered to be the only method by which all our troubles can be solved. I am convinced that only by conciliation we can arrive at a permanent settlement with regard to any dispute, be it in a textile mill, a

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [26th July 1952]

factory or any other establishment. I can assure the hon. Members that if in this case, conciliation fails, I will not hesitate to send it to the Tribunal.

" Sir, I think the hon. Gentlemen Sri Ramamurthi and Sri Jeevanandam referred to what they called victimization of some of the workers of Thompson and Company. I shall give the full facts about the story of this Thompson and Company referred to by the hon. Members of the other side. Let the House decide whether there was victimization."

(Sri P. Ramamurthi was seen rising in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. Minister is not yielding."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" The hon. Member cannot now say that I should not reveal the full facts about that story."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I am not saying like that."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" When two hon. Members Messrs. Jeevanandam and Ramamurthi have referred to the Thompson and Company case and said that there was victimization of workers, I must tell this House what I feel and what I know of this case to prove that there was no victimization at all. The workers of a textile mill declared a strike in this country. In sympathy with that strike, the workers of Thompson & Co., who are Printers declared another strike. What have they to do with textile workers? They had no grievances and so they had no right to declare a strike. Therefore, their strike was an illegal strike. (An hon. Member : ' It is wrong. ') You may say it is wrong. That is my view. Thus, the workers of Thompson & Co., declared a strike in sympathy with the strike declared in a textile mill. This strike by the workers of Thompson and Company was an illegal strike and so there is no question of victimization. That is my point and it is for the House to decide whether it is correct or not.

" The hon. Member, Mr. Palaniyandi, referred to the Manjulai Estate incident and tried to show how cruel our laws are and how they are worked against the interests of the workers. He mentioned an incident in which a husband and wife were working in that Estate. I understand that both the husband and wife were workers in that Estate in Tirunelveli and the husband, for some fault which he committed, was dismissed by the management, and the wife was continuing to work in that Estate. The management now says that if the husband wants to come into the Estate to see his wife, he must get its permission. This is what has taken place. Mr. Palaniyandi dwelt at length on this incident and said there was victimization and so many other things. I have now given the full facts about this incident. I think nobody will be able to see any victimization in this case. It is true that the management has asked the husband to obtain its permission if he wants to enter the Estate. Where is the harm done to the husband? There is no ill-treatment. The labour

26th July 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

laws have not been applied against him. • I can only say that the hon. Member has attempted to take certain things from their context here and there and show to this House as if something terrible has taken place. That is all what I can say about that incident.

“ Sir, the hon. Member, Mr. Jeevanandam, was making some suggestions with regard to the transport workers. I quite agree with him. Ever since, I took charge of this Department, I have been thinking of doing something for the workers. I have been considering whether I could give something to the drivers and conductors either by way of wages or bonus so that they may feel a little happy. I am also considering if I could effect a change in their dress and give them some more amenities. All these are engaging the attention of the Government. I am not going to give bonus because we have made some profits. Even if the Transport has worked at a loss, I would recommend to my Chief Minister that the workers should be paid some bonus so that they can get a few decent sets of dress at least. We are going to help them not because we have made profits and, therefore, I do not agree with the hon. Member in this respect.

4-10
p.m.

“ Then, Mr. Jeevanandam narrated the story of making the workers work for fourteen hours. On enquiry, Sir, I find that it is not all correct. There may be some element of truth in portions of it. As I said, many of the stories narrated by the Opposition, if told in pieces, would give the impression that there is terrible ill-treatment of the workers. If taken in the context in which they should be told, they may look quite normal and, therefore, I say that the hon. Member is not completely correct.

“ Again, the hon. Member referred to the case of Messrs. Jeewanlal Aluminium Metal Factory. Sir, in all these matters we have allowed the law to take its proper course. The normal methods of settlement of disputes are being followed. May be, settlement is delayed by a month or two but it cannot be helped. However, I quite sympathise with those who are affected by the long-drawn-out, tedious process of having to appear before the Bombay Tribunal. This is a hardship, I know. I am glad, however, that the Bombay Tribunal is going to be in Madras for ten days shortly when the workers can make arrangements to meet it. The Tribunal is touring all major cities and workers will be saved the expenses of going to Bombay, spending their well-earned money for the journey and for engaging lawyers to brief their case. I appreciate the difficulty to workers in this regard and it will not arise now.

“ Sir, my Friends, Mr. Muni Reddi and Mr. Jagannathan made out a case for agricultural labour and said that they were paid very low wages. We enquired into this question. Our Economic Adviser has surveyed fifteen villages and we have found out pockets of low wages. We are trying how best this state of affairs could be rectified. As hon. Members know, wages differ with different places. In one place, wages are paid in kind and in another, they are paid in cash. We are trying to evolve

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

[26th July 1952]

a formula by which what is most favourable to the workers can be paid and will be paid by the landlords. It is only a question of time.

“ Then, Sir, there was reference to plantation workers. Till recently plantation workers were outside the purview of laws on Labour. Last year, legislation was introduced bringing the plantation labour also within the purview of the law. The Plantations Labour Act, 1951, provides for the welfare of labour and other amenities.

“ My Friends, sitting opposite, have passed a chit on to me about the Chirala-Vuyyuru-Nellore Motor workers. Let me tell them that the matter is still pending before the Government. I do not think it is proper to say anything about it on the floor of the House because it is a matter which is in a way *sub judice* and I should not indicate to the House what sort of decision we may take on the matter.

“ Sir, my Friend, Mr. Anthony Pillai was saying that the Labour Department was going to be a test for the new Minister for Labour and would be the graveyard of his reputation. I can only tell him that I have made my reputation in other fields and I have no reputation to make as Labour Minister and, therefore, I have nothing to lose either. I shall try to do my best and my Department will try to do their best to help labour to the best of each one's ability. For my part particularly, I shall not stand on prestige and do all I can for labour and strive for the best relations between labour and the employer. (Ministerialist cheers.)

“ Finally, Sir, I come to the charge levelled against the Department of Labour. The charge was made that the officials of the Labour Department were inefficient and corrupt. It is most unfortunate that such statements should have been made on the floor of the House against people who are unable to defend themselves. May I say, on behalf of the Government, how pleased we are with the work of the Labour Department? The Labour Commissioner is here and I hope he will put his fingers to his ears when I say this. The Labour Commissioner and his good set of assistants have been giving the proper kind of advice and assistance to me and such assistance and help cannot be given unless they have a sympathetic heart, a good heart towards labour. This is very important. The officers must have sympathy for labour. I feel, Sir, that if there is one Department which has been doing much work and giving so much assistance, it is the Labour Department. Therefore, when I ask my Friend to have some consideration and withdraw the cut motion and grant the Demand, I shall not be asking for anything unreasonable.”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ Sir, when the Hon. the Minister for Labour rose to reply, I thought he would say something good and would do something for the workers. I thought he would

26th July 1952] [Sri K. P. Gopalan]

announce some measures immediately for improving the lot of labour. But he has not stated anything as to what he is going to do for the working class in this State. So, I am not going to withdraw my cut motion."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I am now going to put the cut motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

'That the allotment of Rs. 18,27,100 under Demand XXIV—Labour including Factories, be reduced by Rs. 100.'

The cut motion was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I am now going to put the main motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

'That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,27,100 under Demand XXIV—Labour including Factories.'

The Demand was carried and the Grant made.

(2) DEMAND XIII—JAILS.

* THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move—

'That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,23,56,000 under Demand XIII—Jails.'

"It will be noticed, Sir, that the Demand for 1952-53 is more than the Demand for 1951-52, which was for Rs. 117.30 lakhs. It is however less than the Revised Estimate for 1951-52 which came to Rs. 126.88 lakhs. The increase in the estimate is mainly due to the larger expenditure anticipated on account of the dietary charges incurred in jails and to the larger provision made for jail manufactures on account of the increase in the cost of raw materials.

"I may mention at the outset that the policy of the Government with regard to the administration of jails is to reform the convicts so that when they are released from the jails they may become good citizens and lead a peaceful and industrious life without breaking the laws of the land. With this end in view they are given general education and are taught industries like carpentry, tailoring, weaving, etc., which would be useful to them after their release.

"Accommodation and classification.—Adult convicts are segregated from adolescents and children, male convicts from female convicts and habituals from casuals. There are separate jails for habituals and for casuals, a special jail for women, two borstal schools for adolescents and certified schools under Government and private managements for children. Prisoners are classified into two classes according to their social standing and mode of life and are allowed privileges appropriate to the class to